

Lay Baptism Invalid:

O R,

An ESSAY

To prove that

Such Baptism

Is Null and Void ;

When Admininister'd in opposition to

The Divine Right

OF THE

Apostolical Succession.

Occasioned chiefly by the Anti-Episcopal Usurpations of our *English* Dissenting Teachers.

The Second Edition Corrected and Enlarged, with an Appendix.

By a Lay Hand.

To which is prefix'd a Letter to the Author by the Reverend *Geo. Hickes*, D. D.

St. John xx. 21, 23. *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. — Whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them.*

Heb. v. 4. *No Man taketh this Honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.*

LONDON: Printed for *J. Baker*, at the *Black-Boy* in *Fater-Noster-Row*, and *A. Collins* at the *Black-Boy* in *Fleet-Street*, 1709.



2305



914:02

A LETTER to the
AUTHOR.

S I R,

THE deplorable State of Christianity in those Parts of it which have reform'd from Popery in Doctrine, is chiefly to be ascrib'd to the Contempt or Neglect of the Divine Institutions relating to the Constitution and Oeconomy of the Church. This in particular hath brought all the Disorder and Confusion in matters of Religion, for which *England* is scandalous above all other Christian Countries, having ever since the Great Rebellion, abounded with Religious Sects and Factions, which owe their Original, more or less, to the direful change and overthrow of that Government, which Christ ordain'd for his Church, and his Apostles left in it, and which throughout all Ages was continued without Interruption in the Christian *World* for 1500 Years, as that very form of Church Government, which all Christians thought was ordain'd to continue unto the End of the World. There never was in all that time any Church founded but in, and
a with

A Letter to the Author.

with **Episcopacy** ; nor did ever any **Seet** of Men assume the **Title** of a Church, till they could get a pretended Bishop, from whom they had their Priests, and their Priests their Mission, till the time of the Reformation ; nor did any Christian Priests, or People of an Episcopal Church, ever rise up against their *Bishops as such*, and reject the *whole Order*, but those of *Great Britain*, under the pretence of farther Reformation, by which they have brought such Confusions, and so expos'd Religion among us, that it is in a great measure lost, so that we may say, (as was long since said of *Justice* in the *Iron-Age* of the World) that she hath taken her flight from Earth to Heaven. Could any Church, or Father of the Catholick Church, in Antient Times, have imagin'd or believ'd without the Gift of Prophecy, that an Age would come, when the Presbyters of a National Church would take upon them to *depose* their *Bishops*, and teach the People that their *Order* was contrary to God's Word, or grievous and unnecessary to the Church ! Could they have imagin'd, that in a flourishing Church, pure in Doctrine and Worship, consisting of Two Provinces. an Assembly of several Presbyters should be held in *opposition* to their Bishops, and

and their Lawful Sovereign Lord the External or Civil Bishop of his Church, by the command of Rebels in actual Arms against their King ! Could they ever imagine, that in three famous National Churches reform'd after the Antient Pattern of Churches settled in the Primitive Times, and professing the same Holy Faith, a strong Party of Presbyters and People, should be so wicked, as by Force to depose the whole College of Bishops, and as much as they could, extirpate the whole Order as unlawful and needless, nay, as an Anti-Christian Constitution, and a Yoak which we nor our Fathers were able to bear ! Yet Sir, I am one of those surviving Men who liv'd in those times, and saw all those things done, and the direful consequences, the first of which was the setting up a Government of the Church by Presbyters assuming Episcopal Authority, who with their Sect were call'd *Presbyterians*.

But these did not long flourish ; for as they had taught the People that Episcopal Ordinations or Missions were not necessary, so others soon said the same of their Ordinations by *Presbyters*, asserting, that only Gifts, and the Call of Gifted Men by the Congregation was sufficient for the Ministry ; and so from the Sect of *Presbytery*

A Letter to the Author.

sprang up that of the *Independents* among us, and from them again, others, who thought Gifts *alone* were a sufficient Call to the Ministry, and in this *abomination of desolation*, *Laymen* first invaded the Sacred Office of the Ministry among us.

When I was a Young School Boy in a little Village near *Helmſley* in *Yorkſhire*; I ſaw a Man in Gray Cloths ſtep up into the Pulpit on the Lord's Day, where after a long Prayer he preach'd to the People, as well as I can gueſs from what I now remember, after the manner of the *Fifth Monarchy Anabaptiſts*. Being afterwards removed to School at *North-Allerton*, I ſaw an Officer of *Cromwell's* Army go up into the Pulpit, and there after a long Prayer, he made a long Sermon, of which, as I then underſtood little, ſo I remember nothing, but that he talk'd much of *Dead Ordinances*, and Gifts of the Spirit, and a *Carnal Miniſtry*, meaning no doubt the *Miniſtry of the Church*. By that time *Quakeriſm*, which began in *Westmoreland*, was much increas'd in that Place, where I often ſaw not only Men, but Women Preach both in the Fields, and in Houſes without any other call, but their pretended Motions of the Spirit, when (you muſt, Sir, excuſe my impertinence to tell you, that) a
School-

A Letter to the Author.

School-Fellow older than my self by 3 or 4 Years, though of a Lower Form in the School, who had been carefully bred up in *Church Principles*, and like another *Timothy* instructed by his Parents from his Childhood in the Scriptures, so baffled their Speakers, by asking them *who sent them to Preach*, and urging the places of Scripture against them, which speak of God the Father's sending our Saviour, and *His* sending the Apostles, and *They* others; and by requiring of them a *Visible* proof of their pretended Call by the Spirit, that they came not of a long time after to that place, and as I remember, not till that Boy, so *mighty in the Scriptures*, was taken from the School.

Indeed Sir, the Necessity of an *Immediate*, or *Mediate* Call and *Mission from God* to any *Divine Ministry*, is so plainly taught in the Scriptures as appears by the * Margin, that I have often wonder'd how any sort of

* *The Mission of Moses.* — *And the Lord said — Come now therefore, and I will send thee unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth my People, &c. out of Egypt. Exod. 3. 10. Now therefore go, and I will be with thy Mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say. Exod 4. 12. He sent Moses his Servant. Psal. 105. 26.*

The Mission of the Jewish Priests, Take thou unto thee Aaron thy Brother, and his Sons with him, from among the Children of Israel, that He may Minister

A Letter to the Author.

Christians, pretending to the Knowledge of them, should take upon them the Ministerial Office, without the Ordinary Regular Call from Man as God hath appoint-

unto me in the Priest's Office, even Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, Eleazer, and Ithamar, Aaron's Sons. Exod. 28. 1. And the Lord spake unto Aaron, ——— Thou and thy Sons with thee shall keep your **Priests Office.** ——— I have given your Priests Office unto you as a Service of Gift, and the **Stranger** that cometh nigh (i. e. as a Priest) shall be put to Death Numb. 18. 1, 7. Uzziah the King transgressed against the Lord his God, and went into the Temple of the Lord to burn Incense upon the Altar of Incense, and Azariah the Priest went in after him, and with him Fourscore Priests of the Lord that were valiant Men: And they withstood Uzziah the King, and said unto him, it appertaineth not unto thee Uzziah to burn Incense unto the Lord, but to the Priests the Sons of Aaron, that are **Consecrated** to burn Incense: Go out of the Sanctuary for thou hast trespassed, &c. 2 Chron 26. 16, 17, 18. For every High Priest taken from among **Ben.** is Ordain'd for Men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both Gifts and Sacrifices for Sin: And no Man taketh this Honour unto himself but he that is **called of God** as was Aaron, Heb 5. 1, 3. Not to spend too much time in enumerating those Texts which prove the Mission of the Prophets, I shall only recite some of those which plainly evince.

The Mission of St. John the Baptist, the Last of the Jewish Prophets, and immediate Fore-runner of our Saviour. There was a **Man sent** from God, whose Name was John. — He was sent to bear witness of that Light (i. e. of Christ) — He that sent me to Baptize, &c. St. John 1. 6, 8, 33. Behold! I send my **Messenger** (i. e. John the Baptist) before thy Face, which shall prepare thy Way before thee, St. Mark 1. 2. & 11. 10.

The Mission of Christ, The Second Person of the Eternal Trinity. — St. John the Baptist speaking of

ed,

A Letter to the Author.

ed, or an extraordinary Call from God, without one of which, neither Christ, nor the Holy Spirit, neither Angels nor Men, presumed to act authoritatively in things pertaining to God.

Him says — He it is, who coming after me is Preferred before me, St. John 1. 27, 30. And our Lord speaking of himself says, He that receiveth me receiveth him (i. e. God the Father) that sent me, St. Matth. 10. 40. St. John 13. 20. — And He that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me, St. Luke 10. 16. — God sent not his Son into the World to condemn the World, but that the World through him might be saved, St. John 3. 17. — Jesus saith, — my Meat is to do the Will of him that sent me, St. John 4. 34. — He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which hath sent him. — He that beareth my Word and believeth on him that sent me hath Everlasting Life. — I seek not mine own Will but the Will of the Father which hath sent me. — The Father hath sent me. — And the Father himself which hath sent me, St. John 5. 23, 24, 30, 36, 37. — The Living Father hath sent me, St. John 6. 57. The Father that sent me, St. John 8. 16, 18. — Say ye of him (i. e. of Christ) whom the Father hath Sanctified (i. e. Consecrated or Set apart for the Office of the Messias) and sent into the World, &c. St. John 10. 36. — That they may believe that thou hast sent me, St. John 11. 42. — I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, he gave me a Commandment what I should say, and what I should speak, St. John 12. 49. — And this is Life Eternal, that they might know thee, the only True God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. — I have finished the Work which thou gavest me to do. I came out from thee. — Thou hast sent me into the World. — Thou hast sent me, St. John 17. 3, 8, 18, 25. — God sent his only Begotten Son into the World, that we might live through him. — And sent his Son to be the propitiation for our Sins, 1 St. John 4. 9, 10. — God sent forth

A Letter to the Author.

But most especially have I wonder'd, and still do wonder, how Clergy-men, I mean, Presbyters who were *regularly sent*, by Episcopal Ordination, according to the

his Son made of a Woman, &c. Galat. 4. 4. — Thus we see that Christ glorified not himself to be made an High Priest, but He that said unto him, Thou art my Son, Heb. 5. 5. — Wherefore let us — Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our Profession Christ Jesus, who was Faithful to him that Appointed him, Heb. 3. 1, 2.

The Mission of the Holy Spirit, the Third Person of the Eternal Trinity. The Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my Name, St. John 14. 26. — When the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, who proceedeth from the Father, &c. St. John 15. 26. — If I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I Depart I will send him unto you, St. John 16. 7. — He shall not speak of Himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak, ver. 13. — He shall glorifie me, for he shall receive of mine and shall shew it unto you, ver. 14. — Accordingly, the Holy Ghost was sent from Heaven on the Day of Pentecost, as St. Peter testified to the wondring Multitude, telling them, — This Jesus — being by the Right Hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the Promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which you now see and hear (i. e. he hath sent forth the Holy Ghost who has caused those astonishing miraculous Wonders which you now see and hear.) Acts 2. 32, 33. — And St. Paul tells the Galatians, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son (i. e. the Holy Ghost) into your Hearts, Galat. 4. 6. — And St. Peter reckons the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven, among those things which the Angels desire to look into, 1 St. Pet. 1. 12.

The Mission of Angels. — They are all Ministering Spirits sent forth to Minister, Heb. 1. 14. — The Angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a City, &c. to a Virgin

Will

A Letter to the Author.

Will of our Lord, the Founder of his Church, and the *Unvariable* and *Universal* Apostolical practice of it for 1500 Years, I say, I still wonder, how such Presbyters

espoused to a Man whose Name was Joseph, — St. Luke 1. 26. — The same Angel appeared before unto Zacharias and told him, — *I am Gabriel that stand in the presence of God, and am sent to speak unto thee.* — ver. 19. Peter said, Now I know of a Surety that the Lord hath sent his Angel, and hath deliver'd me out of the Hand of Herod, &c. Acts 12. 11. — The Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him, &c. He sent and signified it by his Angel unto his Servant John, Revelat. 1. 1. — The Seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the Earth, Revelat. 5. 6. — The Lord God sent his Angel to shew unto his Servants the things which must shortly be done, Revelat. 22. 6.

The Mission of the Apostles. After the Twelve Apostles are nam'd, 'tis said, These Twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them saying — Preach — freely ye have received freely give, St. Matth. 10. 5, 7, 8. — As my Father hath sent me even so send I you, St. John 20. 21. — All power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth. Go ye therefore and teach (or rather Disciple) all Nations, baptizing them — teaching them — and lo I am with you always even unto the end of the World. Amen. St. Mat. 28. 18, 19, 20. — And to supply the Place of Judas Iscariot one of the Twelve, the Apostles prayed and said, thou Lord which knowest the Hearts of all Men, shew whether of these Two (i. e. of Justus or Matthias) thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this Ministry and Apostleship, Acts 1. 24, 25. And they gave for their Lots, and the Lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbred with the Eleven Apostles, ver. 26. — God hath set some in the Church, First Apostles, 1 Cor. 12. 28. — Our Lord said to Ananias concerning the Apostle St. Paul, — He is a chosen Vessel unto me to bear my Name before the Gentiles, and Kings, and the Children of Israel, Acts 9. 15.

could

A Letter to the Author.

could first preach against the Episcopal Order, and then proceed to pull down their own Bishops, by whom they were Ordain'd, and then in opposition to the Holy

— As they Minister'd to the Lord and Fasted, the Holy Ghost said, **seperate** me Barnabas and Saul (i. e. Paul) for the Work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their Hands on them they sent them away; so they being **sent forth** by the Holy Ghost departed, &c. Acts 13. 2, 3, 4. Again, the Lord said unto St. Paul, Depart, for I will **send** thee far hence unto the Gentiles, Acts 22. 21. — And therefore he styles himself **Paul called** to be an Apostle of Jesus Christ, through the Will of God, 1 Cor. 1. 1. and says in another Place, — I am **Ordained** a Preacher, and an Apostle — a Teacher of the Gentiles, 1 Tim. 2. 7. — How shall they Preach except they **be Sent**, Rom. 10. 15. — When He (i. e. Christ) ascended up on High, — He **gave** some Apostles, i. e. he gave some the Power and Authority of being his Ambassadors, Ephes. 4. 11. —

The Division of the Seventy Disciples, and of the Deacons. After these things the Lord appointed other Seventy also, and sent them Two and Two before his Face, St. Luke 10. 1. — The Twelve (i. e. the Apostles) called the Multitude of the Disciples unto them and said, — Look ye out among you Seven Men of Honest Report full of the Holy Ghost and Wisdom, whom **We** may appoint, over this Business, (i. e. of taking care for the Poor). — And they chose Stephen, &c. whom they set before the Apostles; and when they had prayed they laid their Hands on them, Acts 6. 3, 5, 6. —

The Division of the Apostles Successors. — S. Paul and St. Barnabas **Ordained** them Elders in every Church, Acts 14. 23. — For this cause left I thee (i. e. Titus) in Crete that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and **Ordain** Elders in every City, as I (i. e. St. Paul) had appointed thee, Tit. 1. 5. — Stir up the Gift of God which is in thee (i. e. Stir up that Episcopal Authority, and the Gifts annex'd thereto, where-
Apostolical

A Letter to the Author.

Apostolical Order and Character, and the persons lawfully vested with it, Sacrilegiously presume, like *Colluthus*, to take upon them the Episcopal Office, and power in Ordaining and Sending of other pretended Presbyters into the Church, as they did in

with God has endow'd thee) **by the putting on of my (i. e. St. Paul's) Hands,** 2 Tim. 1. 6. — *The Things that thou hast heard of me — the same commit thou to Faithful Men, who shall be able to Teach others also,* 2 Tim. 2. 2. — **Lay Hands suddenly on no Man,** 1 Tim. 5. 22. — *The Seven Stars are the Angels (i. e. the Bishops, or supream Spiritual Governours) of the Seven Churches,* Rev. 1. 20. — Of which St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna was one. Now that these Successors of the Apostles, to whom the Power of Ordaining others into the Ministry was committed, were not mere Presbyters is evident from hence, that they had the oversight of the Church of God, 1 Pet. 5. 2. A Power to receive an **Accusation** against (and therefore were each of them a **Judge** of) an Elder or Minister of a consequently Inferiour Order, 1 Tim. 5. 19. — It was also their Province to **Rebuke with all Authority,** so as to let no Man despise them, Tit. 2. 15. — *to reject, i. e. excommunicate, a Man that is an Heretick after the First and Second Admonition,* Tit. 3. 10. — **Without preferring one before another, doing nothing by Partiality,** 1 Tim 5. 21. — Hence the particular *Angel, or Bishop of the Church in Pergamos,* was justly reprov'd for Tolerating them that held the Doctrine of Balaam, and the Nicolaitans in that Church, Rev. 2. 14, 15, 16. So also was the particular Angel or Bishop of *Thyatira,* for suffering the false Prophetess Jezebel, Rev. 2. 20. — And they could never have been thus justly censur'd, if they had not been vested with the Powers and Authority above mention'd, and these Powers do vastly exceed all that can be duly claim'd by any mere Presbyter, or Body of Presbyters whatsoever. —

all

A Letter to the Author.

all, or most parts of the Nation, after the Abolition of Episcopacy, and the Down-fall of the National Church with it, in the times of which I speak. Such Arch-schismatics as these were Mr. *Bowls* of *Tork*, Mr. *Baxter* of *Kidderminster*, and Mr. *Hughes* of *Plymouth*, not to mention *SMEC-TTMNVUS*, [*Stephen Marshal*, *Edmond Calamy*, *Thomas Young*, *Matthew Newcomb*, *William Spurstow*,] of *London*, where I presume pretended Presbyters were also Ordain'd, by mere Presbyters in those sad times of confusion.

I was once at one of their pretended Ordinations, which I since found, was much after the French Form. Thus, and This, Sir, was the Original of the *Presbyterian Mission in England*, and it is against the Authority of the pretended Ministers of this Mission, *who were never duly Authoriz'd*, and therefore cannot Administer *truly Valid Baptism*, that you have written your excellent Book with great Strength, and perspicuity, as well as Modesty, and confirmed your Doctrine with your Practice.

Indeed, you have written it throughout with so much Modesty and Caution, that in some places, it hath an Air *almost* of Diffidence and Mistrust, although you have said nothing as to the Invalidity of their Administrations, but what our
best

A Letter to the Author.

best Divines have written before you. I beg leave to present you with what I find to this purpose, in the First Volume of the Posthumous Sermons of one of the greatest of them, [Bishop Beveridge] entituled, *The Dignity, and Authority, and Office of the Priesthood*. In the Third Sermon on this Text, *Therefore, seeing we have this Ministry as we have received mercy, we faint not*, at the 103. Page you'll find these Words, "*In the next Place we must observe, that although the Priests, if any be present, lay on their Hands also, yet it is expressly order'd, that the Bishop shall say the Words, Receive ye the Holy Ghost, &c. For, if a mere Priest should say them, or any one but a Bishop, the Ordination was reckon'd Null and void*, with more to that purpose. So in his Sermon on *Acts 13. 3.* "*And when they had fasted, and prayed, and laid their Hands on them, they sent them away*, you have these Words at p. 309. "*As the right Ordination of those, who Administer the Means of Grace must needs be acknowledged to be (necessary). for seeing we can have no Grace, nor Power to do Good, but what is delivered to us from God through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the use of the means which he hath establish'd for that purpose, unless those means be rightly and duly Administred,* "*they*

A Letter to the Author.

“ they loose their Force, and Energy, and
“ so can never attain the end, wherefore
“ they were established. *Neither is there*
“ *any thing more necessary to establish the*
“ *means of Grace, than that they who Ad-*
“ *minister them be rightly Ordained and*
“ *Authorized to do it according to the Insti-*
“ *tution, and Command of him that did*
“ *establish them. For seeing they do not*
“ *work naturally, but only by virtue of the*
Institution, and Promise annex'd to it, *un-*
“ *less that be duly observed, we have no*
“ *ground to expect, that the Promise should*
“ *be performed, nor by consequence that they*
“ *should be effectual to the Purposes for which*
“ *they are used.* So in his Sermon on this Text.
“ *Now then we are Ambassadors for Christ, &c.*
“ *p. 386. For that can be done only by the power*
“ *of God, accompanying, and assisting his own*
“ *Institution and Commission. Inasmuch that*
“ *if I did not think, or rather was not fully*
“ *assured, that I had such a Commission to*
“ *be an Ambassadour for Christ, and to act*
“ *in his Name, I should never think it worth*
“ *the while to Preach, or execute my Ministe-*
“ *rial Office. For I am sure all that I did*
“ *would be Null and Void of it self, accord-*
“ *ing to God's ordinary way of working, and*
“ *we have no ground to expect Miracles.* So in
another Place of that Sermon ; “ *Any Man*
“ *may*

A Letter to the Author.

“ may read a Sermon or make an oration to the
“ People, but it is not that, which the Scrip-
“ ture calls Preaching the Word of God, un-
“ less he be SENT by God to do it. For how
“ can they Preach except they be sent. Rom.
“ 10. 16. *A Butcher might kill an Ox, or a*
“ *Lamb as well as the High-priest, but it was*
“ *no Sacrifice to God, unless a Priest did it.*
“ *And no Man taketh this Honour to himself,*
“ *but he that is called of God, as was Aaron,*
“ *&c.* All these Passages, Sir, exactly agree
with the Subject of your Book, and I might
shew you much more to the same purpose
out of the Writings of the Clergy, besides
those, which you have cited, p. 101. as out of
the Second Edition of a Letter to a Noncon-
Minister of the Kirk, shewing the Nullity of the
Presbyterian Mission. And Dr. Wells's *Theses*
against the Validity of Presbyterian Ordination.

But what I have cited from the Bishop,
which was Published since the First Edition
of your Book, is enough to second the design
of it, and give you courage boldly to main-
tain your Doctrine and Practice, and the
cause not only of the Church of *England*, but
of the Catholick Church against the *British*
Sects and Schisms. Indeed you have done
God and his Church good service in a time
of need, as Two worthy Citizens now
with God, Mr. *Allen*, and Mr. *Lamb* did
by their Writings about Forty Years ago,
who

A Letter to the Author.

who having gone from the Church to the *Anabaptists*, by God's Grace saw their Error, and returned both together from them to the Church again, to which they made ample recompence by their Writings, and were great Ornaments to it in every respect all their Lives long. I knew them both very well, and am glad of this opportunity, to mention them with that respect which is due to both their Memories, whereof the former told me, that he had the Misfortune to lead Mr. *Allen* out of the Church to the Schism, but that Mr. *Allen* had the blessed part to lead him out of the Schism to the Church again. It is to me a comfortable presage, that God will not forsake the Church of *England* nor suffer Toleration, and the Gates of Hell to prevail against her, because he raises out of her People, Men to defend her, and adorn her with their Writings. I pray God to stir up more such continually, that those, who are misled by unauthorized Ministers, and Teachers, may consider the great danger they are in, and after your Example, enter in at the right Door into her Fold, and declare, as you have bravely done, p. 119, 120. *that you sincerely believe the Subject of your Discourse to be a substantial Truth, nay even a first Principle of Christianity,*

A Letter to the Author.

*Christianity; and that without the courageous asserting thereof, the whole Christian Priesthood, and the Divine Authority of it, must be called in question, — and encourage every bold Intruder to usurp the Sacred Ministry, in opposition to that Commission, which hath been constantly handed down from Christ and his Apostles to this very day. In the same Place you say you hope, that none vested with this Divine Authority will fight against it, &c. which if any Clergy-man should do, in the manner as you there mention, I could not but suspect, that he was one of those who took Gifts and Presents of the Dissenters, to let the Names of their Children, who had no other but Schismatical Lay-Baptisms, be Registred among the True Baptisms of the Church. This unwarrantable Practise, which you have observed, to be “scandalously practised in some Places, I can confirm to be true; For I knew some Ministers of this City, (now dead) who were guilty of this practise, and are gone to God to give an account of it; and I my self, soon after I was presented to the Vicarige of *Allhallows Barkin*, had several, and some very great Offers, from Dissenters, to enter their Childrens Names, as Baptiz’d, in the Parish Church Register; and a Parochial Priest of a great City in*

b

this

A Letter to the Author.

this Kingdom, who gave me a Visit about a Year since, did assure me, that all the Ministers of that Place, himself only excepted, were guilty of this execrable practice; execrable I call it, because it is a double falsification of our *Parochial Dptychs*, as they are Registers and Records both of Church and State, and I think both Deprivation, and the Pillory to be just Punishments for that Minister, who dares do so great and mischievous a wickedness, or suffer it to be done.

I say, I should be tempted to suspect any Clergy-man, that should write in the manner you mention, against you, to be one of that corrupt sort, or at least of another, who to court the Favour and Applause of the *Dissenters*, either never Preach in defence of the Church against *them*, or if they do, they do it no otherwise than barely to shew, that the Church of *England* is a *safe Communion*, and that those, who through mistake separated from it, would be in *no danger of Damnation* if they returned to it. But to shew that separation from it is **Schism**, and by consequence a *damning Sin*, and that the Separatists of all sorts from it, are, without the extraordinary mercy of God, in great and apparent danger of *Damnation*, these

Gentle.

A Letter to the Author.

men love not to touch upon that Point, nor rise to that Heighth, which long before the Revolution occasioned the distinction between *High* and *Low* Church-men and the former to be called by ill, or ignorant Men, *High-Flyers*, *Tantivies*, and other such opprobrious Names. It was, I suppose, a Reflection upon these Men, and the Indignation he had against their double practises; which provoked a Divine not very many Years since, to utter a Sarcasm upon them from the Pulpit, in Words to this Purpose, *That some* (at the time he spoke it) *were become Fathers of the Church, who never were her true Sons.*

Sir, I with all Clergy-men, who are concerned in either of these Remarks, would seriously consider your pious and seasonable Address to us in the conclusion of your *Appendix*. We are all concerned, (as you beseech and conjure us to do,) to consider our *High and Holy Calling to the Priesthood*, and to vindicate our *unalienable Rights to administer the Holy Sacraments*, and to let the People understand, that the *Ministration of them is essential to our Office*, and our *Office essential to the Ministration of them*, and that our long and general silence in not asserting, and defending this great Truth, hath, as you

b 2

observe.

A Letter to the Author.

observe, been the occasion of much ignorance among the People, of the nature of Schism, and the direful consequences of it, which some of our Order still are, as I am sure some have been, so averse (contrary to their Trust, and the Duty of it) to set before the People. I remember, when some of the *London Clergy*, resolving to do this, as you now beseech us, and for the same Reasons; it was opposed, especially by one of them, for no other reason, but that it would be *censured as Preaching up our selves*; a Reason, whereof the Weakness and Ill-consequences are shewn by an excellent Person, in the Preface to his *Companion for the Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England*, where, to oblige the Clergy to instruct the People in the great Truth of Sacerdotal Mission, and Authority to administer the Sacraments, He wishes the Catechism of the Church might be continued, in a few Questions and Answers to shew, who only have Power to administer the Holy Sacraments. I need not name this worthy Gentleman, whom God raised up out of the *People* before you, to defend the Rights and Authority of the *Priesthood*, and who thinks it no more diminution, or dishonour to him, to be thought one of the *People* with respect to the *Church*, than one of them with respect to the *State*.

In

A Letter to the Author.

In your *Appendix* to your Book, I think you have solidly and satisfactorily answer'd all the Objections that have been made against the useful Subject of it, since the First Edition, taking in your Second Thoughts, and the explanation of your Design, and meaning, in some Passages of it to prevent Offence. This, Sir, is an argument of your great Humility, as well as of your Zeal and Prudence; and your humble and truly Christian Temper and Declaration in p. 146, encourage me to make a few Remarks upon your *Appendix*, of which you have the liberty to judge as you please. P. 149, you have well observed, *that our Church hath provided no Office of Confirmation* for those, who receive Baptism from *Lay-Baptizers*. And indeed it would have been strange, that she, which allows of no Baptism but by a **Lawful Minister*, should have provided such an Office to confirm, or ratify the Baptism of those, who truly speaking, were *Sprinkled*, or *Washed*, but not *Baptized*. But I think, you might with reason enough have farther observed, that she hath provided an Office for their true and lawful Baptism. I mean, Sir, **The Ministration of Baptism to such as are of riper years** This

** Rubrics in the Ministration of Private Baptism.*

A Letter to the Author.

new Office was made presently after *the Restauration*, and is part of the *Liturgy*, that now is confirmed by Act of Parliament. And I do not think it was intended *only* for *Heathens*, *Jews*, and *Mahometans*, who should be converted to Christianity, or for such converted Hereticks among us as reject Baptism, but also for those who had been *Invalidly Baptiz'd*, of which there were great Numbers at the time of the Restauration; and now alas! are many more. I submit this Observation to your Thoughts, and the consideration of all, who shall read it; and if my Opinion as to this Office is wrong, I hope my Errour is pardonable, because it is not hurtful to the Church, nor casts the least dishonour upon her Learned and Pious Bishops, and Priests, her Representatives, who made that Office, which before was wanting. What you there say of the Passage in the preceeding Page, concerning *the Validity of Lay Baptism*; viz. 'that the Learned Author never design'd, that any thing in his excellent Book should favour *Lay Baptism* in opposition to the Sacerdotal power, is evidently true, because it is plain from his Words, he means *Lay-Baptism* Administred by *Lay-Men*, so and so qualified, to dying Persons, by the Authority

A Letter to the Author.

rity and Allowance of the Church, as in the 38th Canon of the Council of *Eliberis* which you cite p. 12. of your *Preliminary Discourse*. And it is very praise worthy in you that upon Second Thoughts, you correct your self in your Premonition, where you tell us, “ You do not presume to determine, whether the “ Church which hath power from Christ to “ give a Man a standing Commission to be a “ Priest, cannot in Cases of extream necessity “ give him a Commission *pro hac vice*, (or *pro hic & nunc*) to do a Sacerdotal Act. This Commission of that Council, proceeded, * from an Antient, but a Pious, and innocent erroneous opinion, (as I think I may call it) that *Baptism* was **absolutely** necessary to Salvation, as the communicating of Infants proceeded from another the like erroneous belief of the *absolute* necessity of receiving the Holy Eucharist in order to Salvation. This Error of the absolute necessity of Baptism, descended in the † Latin Church to after Ages, and acquired such firmness of belief by constant practise, that it re-

* Tertull. *de Baptismo*. Cap. xvii. vid. Vossium *de Baptismo Disput.* xi. v. vi. vii.

† According to the Canon Law : *In necessitate quilibet potest baptizare, dum modo intendit facere quod Ecclesia intendit.*

A Letter to the Author.

mained * some time uncorrected by our Church after the Reformation, but afterwards the Title of the Office for *Private Baptism* was alter'd thus, '*Of them that are*
" *to be Baptized in time of necessity* by the
" Minister of the Parish, or any lawful Mi-
" nister that can be procured; and the Ru-
brick was accordingly alter'd in this man-
ner," Let the lawful Minister, *and them that*
" *be present, call upon God for his Grace, and*
" *say the Lord's Prayer if the time will suffer,*
" *and then the Child being named by some one*
" *that is present, the said lawful Minister*
" *shall dip it in Water, or pour Water upon*
" *it, saying these Words, I baptize thee, &c.*
to this change of the Title and Rubrick
of *them that are to be Baptized in Private*,
(in K. Edward's Book) exactly agrees the
Rubrick of our present Liturgy, cited be-
fore in the Margin.

Sir, from these Observations I think I

* As appears from this Rubrick of the Office for them
that be Baptized in Private Houses in time of necessity, in
the Book of Common-Prayer, set forth Anno 2. and 3.
of Edward the Sixth, 1549. The Words of that Rubrick
are these, First, let them that be present call upon God
" for his Grace, and say the Lord's Prayer, if the time
" will suffer, & then one of them shall name the Child,
" and dip him in the Water, or pour Water upon him,
" saying, *I Baptize thee in the Name, &c.* vide *Vossius de*
Baptismo Disp. x. §. x.

may

A Letter to the Author.

may conclude, *First*, that the *absolute indispensable* necessity of Baptism is not the Doctrine of the Church of *England*. *Secondly*, that she approves of no Baptism, or thinks no Baptism duly and validly Administred, but what is Ministred by duly Authorized & lawful Ministers, and consequently that she rejects all *Lay-Baptism*. *Thirdly*, That she cannot count those duly authorized and lawful Ministers, who take upon them the Ministry within the pale of her Jurisdiction, in contempt of, and opposition to her Episcopat and Episcopal Mission, or Power of Ordination ; and by consequence, that she must look upon Baptism Administred by such Ministers, as Null and Void, from the Beginning. From these Conclusions, and the Consequences issuing from them, I have further reason to think, that the Office of *The Ministration of Baptism to such as are of Riper Years*, was intended for Persons *invalidly Baptized by such unlawful Ministers* among us, as were never duly Authorized, as well as for converted *Heathens, Jews, Mahometans*, and such modern *Manicheans*, and *Seleucians* amongst us, as held it unlawful to Baptize with the Baptism of the Church.

And as you have justly observed, that the learned Author of the passage you cite in p. 148. could not design, that any thing

A Letter to the Author.

thing he said in it should favour *Lay-Baptism*: So I dare say for him, that upon Second Thoughts, he will not affirm that it is in the power of the Church to confirm *Ludicrous* Histrionical or other *Mimical Baptisms*, or that any Church or Bishop did ever confirm any of them by Chrism and Imposition of Hands. The Opinion of *Ludicrous Baptism* not to be reiterated, was occasioned by a fabulous Story of *Athanasius*, who, when a little Boy, with others, playing at *Ministers*, as our Children call it, by the Water-side, *Athanasius* acted the *Bishop*, other Boys *Priests* and *Deacons*, and in their Play Baptized several Children, who represented *Catechumens* and *Competents* in form. *Alexander*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, happening to see this, as the Story is told, sent for the Boys, and understanding from their own Relation, that their *Ludicrous Baptism* was performed by them according to the Rites and Orders of the Church, was of opinion with other Bishops present with him, that the Children so Christned, were not to be Re-baptized, whereupon he confirmed them with Chrism, and Imposition of Hands.

This

A Letter to the Author.

This * *Hear-say* Story is told by *Sozomen* from *Ruffinus*, and from him again at large by *Petrus Damianus*, in his Book entituled *Gratissimus*, and mentioned before him by *Watafridus Strabo*, in his Book *de Divinis Officiis*, and reckoned by *Antonius Muretus* in the 9th Chap, of his 13th Book of *various Lectiōns*, among the presages of things that have happened, as Boys have acted them in Play. Lastly, such reception this Story of *Athanasius* hath had in the World, that it is cited as true by Dr. *George Abbot*, in the Lecture which he read in the Divinity-School at Oxford, *de Circumcisione & Baptismo*, 1597, which Lecture he made, to excuse the First Practice of our Church after the Reformation, which he saith *Facilitate larga* with great Latitude or Indulgence for some time tolerated the Baptism of Lay-men and Women in absolute necessity, for the ignorance of the People and hardness of their Hearts. This Story favoured the loose Doctrine of St. *Augustin*, as to the Ministrations of Baptism, and therefore we need not wonder that † He spoke

* Περὶ τῶν γενομένων τούτων ΦΑΣΙΝ ἐπ' αὐτῶν συμβεβηκέναι.
Sozom. Eccl. Hist. Lib. 2. Ch. 17.

† *De Baptismo contra Donatistas. Lib. 7. Versus finem Libri in Tom. 7.*

A Letter to the Author.

so favourably of *Ludicrous*, and *Jocular*, as well as *Mimical* and *Histrionical* Baptisms. But as current as by misfortune this Story hath been, and as many as it hath led into Errour, it is now exploded for very good Reasons by Learned Men, as by Dr. *Cave* in his *Historia Literaria*, by *du Pin* in his Notes on *Athanasie* in his *Nouvelle Bibliotheque*, and by the Learned *Benedictins* in his Life, p. 11. Printed before his Works, whither I refer you.

As for *Histrionical Baptism* by *Heathens*, that also is urged by the Patrons of *Lay-Baptism* in favour of their opinion. † Of this they cite this Story out of the *Cronicon Alexandrinum*; that in mockery of the Christians, the Heathen-Players Baptized one of their Companions in warm Water, upon the Stage, and then put upon him a White Garment, upon which he immediately cryed out that he was made a Christian, and would dye as such. The Spectators hearing him declare this, flew upon the Stage, and taking him from thence stoned him to death. † *Ado Viennensis* tells another Story in his Martyrology of *August. 25. of St. Genesius*, who being Baptized by

† *Vossius de Baptismo disp. 11. §. 29.*

† *Ibid disp. 10. §. 13.*

A Letter to the Author.

Heathens to ridicule Christian Baptism, also became a Christian : But then supposing the truth of these Stories, they are as *perfectly miraculous*, as the conversion of some Pagan Executioners of Martyrs, who declared themselves Christians at the place of Execution, and there suffered death with them, and were *Baptized in their own Blood*. And therefore, the *miraculous* manifestation of God's Grace at Historical Baptisms to testify the truth of the Christian Religion, and confound its Adversaries, are no argument for Lay-men to take upon them to Administer Baptism upon any pretence whatsoever. Nay, Sir, such an unwarrantable Latitude hath the Church of *Rome* given to the Administration of Baptism, † that some of her *Popes*, have allowed the Baptism of *Jews*, and Heathens, and * the Pope in the Council of *Florence* doth expressly decree, that in *case of necessity* not only a faithful Christian *Lay-man*, or *Woman*, but an *Heretick* or *Pagan* may Validly Baptize.

† Ibid Disp. II. 18.

* In decreto Eugenii Papæ ad Armenos: *Minister hujus Sacramenti est sacerdos, cui ex officio competit Baptizare. In Causa autem necessitatis, non solum sacerdos, vel Diaconus, sed etiam Laicus, vel Mulier, imo etiam Paganus, & Hæreticus Baptizare potest, &c.*

A Letter to the Author.

As to the case of necessity, so called, it is, as I have already observed, founded in the mistaken opinion of the absolute necessity of Baptism to Salvation. Which Opinion is of Two Sorts, one more antient, grounded on the literal strictness of the Precept, or institution of Baptism, which was the Errour of *Tertullian*, who therefore in case of necessity, allowed Lay-men, but not Women, to Baptize. The other is more modern, as having its rise from the *Pelagian* Controversy, and that was the indispensable necessity of Baptism to wash away Original Sin. This strictness of opinion, as to the indispensable necessity of this Sacrament, to wash off the guilt of Original Sin, made *St. Augustin*, that *durus Pater Infantium*, so very loose, as to the Minister of it in case of necessity. And therefore upon the Question, *whether one, who was not a Christian, could give Baptism*, * He delivered his Opinion uncertainly, saying *he would not determine it, because it had not been determined in any Council*. And so from this Errour of the absolute necessity of Baptism to Salvation, the Church of *Rome* came by degrees, to allow the Ministration of Baptism by any

* *Contra Epist. pannen. Lib. 2. Cap. 13.*

A Letter to the Author.

Hand, when a lawful Minister could not be had, rather than let a Child perish, which without it they formerly thought must be damned, and still think cannot be saved, as suffering *panam damni*, tho' not *panam sensus*, i. e. the Loss of Heaven, tho' not the *Flames* of Hell. * Hence they came to place all the virtue, and efficacy of Baptism in the invocation of the Holy Trinity, as in the principal cause, not making any difference in the Ministerial, or Instrumental cause, in case of necessity. But, Sir, you have shew'd with great force and clear evidence, that the *Lawful Minister* is as *essential* to Baptism, as the Matter, and Form, and cannot be dispensed with by Men, who are tyed to it by the Divine Institution. But though God tyes us, yet he himself is not tyed to his own Institutions; and therefore the erroneous opinion of the absolute necessity of Baptism by any Minister, either upon the account of the letter of the Institution, or of Original Sin, hath been long rejected by Learned Men, for great, and I think, unanswerable Reasons, as you may see in Archbishop Bramhall's Letter to Sir Henry de Vic, at

* *Decretum Eugenii P. ad Armenos in Conc Florent. Conc. Labb. & Cossar. Tom. 13. p. 535.*

the

A Letter to the Author.

the 979. p. of his Works, and in the 7 Disp. of *Vossius's* Book *de Baptismo*.

I am extremely pleased with the modest Reflection you make in your Premonition upon what you had said p. 135. of your Book to prove *the Validity of Holy Orders conferred on Unbaptized Persons*. For whereas you distinguish Qualifications for the Ministry, into *Personal* and *Authoritative*, give me leave to tell you, that I think all Qualifications for it are *Personal*, and that of *Personal Qualifications*, the want of *some only* make a Man unworthy of the Ministry, but not incapable of it; but the want of others make him utterly incapable of it, or of being Seperated or Ordained to it. The *Personal Qualifications* of the First sort may be called *Moral*, as Purity, Humility, Sobriety, and all other Vertues and Graces that are comprehended in Holiness of Life, the want of which make a Man unworthy, as of Holy Orders after Baptism, so of Baptism it self, but yet do not Null or make Void either of them, when the Person is Baptized or Ordained. The Second sort of Qualifications are either *Natural*, *Acquired*, or *Legal*, which last may be also call'd *Political*, as relating to the Fundamental or Positive Laws of the Church. among *acquired Qualifications*

A Letter to the Author.

cations we may safely reckon *Reading*, the want of which utterly disables a Man from performing Priestly Offices, and by consequence, makes his Orders Void. Then as for *Natural Qualifications*, they belong either to the *Body* or the *Mind*; to the *Body*, as speaking, seeing, hearing, the want of which (without any * *Canons* or *Positive Laws* of the Church) in my judgment, utterly unqualifies a Man for the Priesthood; and therefore Holy Orders conferred on a Deaf, and Dumb, or Incurable Blind Man, must, in my opinion be Null and Void, because they render him incapable of performing Ministerial Offices. The like I may say of a Man who wants both his Hands, who though never so worthy upon the score of *Moral Qualifications*, yet, by reason of that natural incapacity, cannot effectually be made a Priest. Qualifications which belong to the *Mind* are Understanding and Memory, the want of which in *Idiots*, *Lunatics*, and *Maniacs* makes them so utterly incapable of receiving Holy Orders, that upon supposition, any such were Ordained to the Priesthood, his Orders would be Null and Void. Thus much, Sir, with submission to the

* *Can. Apost. 69.*

A Letter to the Author.

Learned, I have said of Personal Qualifications for the Priesthood that are Moral, or Natural. The *Legal* likewise are of Two Sorts, *First*, such as are *fundamental* to the Christian Society, or Constitution of the Church; or *Secondly*, such as are super-induced by the *Positive Laws* of the Church. Of the *First* sort, in my Opinion, *Baptism* certainly is, the want of which therefore I think, must utterly render a Man incapable of being a *Christian Priest*, because it makes him utterly incapable of *being a Christian*, or of receiving the Holy Eucharist, which to an Un-baptized Person is *void and sure* a Sacrifice of no more effect than if he had not come to it; and how then can a Man be made capable to Administer that Holy Sacrament to others who hath no right to receive it, or make others Members of the Church, of which he is not a Member himself? As to the latter sort of Legal Qualifications, the want of which do make a Man incapable of Holy Orders, and his Orders Null after he is Ordained, by the Canons of the Church; I have no occasion to discourse, and therefore in answer to the Objection made against you, give me leave to observe, that I presume it relates to this case, which is supposed, but never proved

to be true

to

A Letter to the Author.

to have happened, *viz.* that when a Person *bona fide*, believing himself to have had Valid Priestly Baptism, but indeed had not, yet happens to be Ordained *Bona Fide*, by the Bishop, his Orders notwithstanding are Null and Void. This, I presume, must be the case in which the Objection is put, and not where the Person Ordaining, and the Person Ordained, both *know* that the latter never received any other than *Lay-Baptism*, by one presuming to Baptize in opposition to the Church. these Two Cases are so vastly different, that I believe as to the latter, all Divines truly Learned in their profession will make no difficulty to determine, that Orders so conferred are Null and Void. But as to the former case, upon which I take it for granted the Objection proceeds, we must have recourse to *Equity*, which, in such Cases of perfect invincible ignorance, takes place in Ecclesiastical as well as Civil Cases, in Divine as well as Humane Laws. Therefore, Sir, I make no scruple to tell you, that a Priest in this case now before us, is in the Eyes of God a Valid Priest, and that all his Priestly Administrations, are by his allowance also Valid and Effectual, and as acceptable as those of other Priests to him, who can make allowances

A Letter to the Author.

where Men cannot, and ratifie what Men, if it came to their knowledge, could not ratifie, but must pronounce Null. You know the Priesthood was hereditary among the *Jews*, and it is not unreasonable to suppose, that one Priest or other in such a long tract of time might, without any suspicion, have an adulterous Son; upon which supposition, I believe you will not doubt, that when he was at Age to Administer, God would reckon him among the Priests, and accept of all his Administrations at the Altar; or if such an one happened to be High Priest, even in the very *Holy of Holies*, though if his incapacity had been known, he must have been deposed from the Priesthood.

Sir, in this way of stating the Case, I am far from encouraging any Person so Baptized, to take upon him the Priesthood. For if such an one, knowing himself to have no other Baptism, offers himself to take Holy Orders, I think he commits, a Piacular Sin as great as that of *Corah*; nay, if such a one but suspecting himself to have no other Baptism, takes Holy Orders, I think he commits a Sin of Presumption, and is obliged to a strict enquiry, whether or no he was so Baptized; and if he finds he was, he is bound, as he expects Forgiveness

A Letter to the Author.

giveness of God, to cancel his Orders, and abdicate himself from the Priesthood. But to prevent either of these supposable Cases, you, like a good Christian, have p. 140. inculcated to the Governours of the Church, *how much it is for her security, and ought to be their care, to require of all Candidates of the Ministry, Certificates of their Baptism, as well as of their good Conversation*; after which I beg leave to say, according to my distinction of Personal Qualifications for the Priesthood, that the want of the former makes a Man incapable to receive Holy Orders, but the want of the latter only makes him unworthy to receive them.

P. 28. You prudently and modestly decline the great dispute, which exercised the Church of Old, about the manner of admitting Persons Baptized in *Heresy* and *Schism*. You know there was the like dispute among the Apostles about Circumcision, and the observation of the Mosaick Law, but as St. * *Augustin* observes, without any breach of Charity. And as it pleases God to let the Governours of his Church be sometimes exercised with great difficulties, so were they in some of the Golden

* *Contra Cresconium*. Lib. 2.

A Letter to the Author.

Ages of it exercised with this Question; but as the same Father * observes, *salva unitate*, without dividing the Unity of the Churches. To prove this, he cites the Words of St. Cyprian which he spoke at the opening of the Council of Carthage, in which he was at the Head of the most rigid Side; to shew his Moderation in this dispute, of which you may see a short, but clear account, in the Learned Note upon Meam Sententiam in 243. p. of Cyprian's Works, Printed at Oxford, 1382. The Words are these, *Superest, ut de hac ipsa re singuli, quid sentiamus, proferamus, neminem Judicantes, aut a jure Communione aliquem, si diversum senserit, amoventes.* So in his Epistle to Jubaianus, though he strenuously and warmly defends his Opinion, yet he concludes with great modesty, and meekness, *hac tibi breviter pro nostra mediocritate rescripsimus, Frater charissime, nemini prescribentes, aut prejudicantes, quo minus unusquisque Episcoporum, quod putat faciat, habens arbitrii sui liberam potestatem. Nos quantum in nobis est*

* Ibid. Neque enim parvi momenti, quod inter Episcopos Anterioris Etatis quam esse inciperet Pars Donati, ista quaestio fluctuavit, Et varias haberet inter se Collegarum, salva Unitate, Sententias.

propter

A Letter to the Author.

propter Hereticos cum Collegis & Co-Episcopis nostris non contendimus, cum quibus Divinam Concordiam, et dominicam pacem tenemus, maxime cum & Apostolus dicat, si quis autem putaverit contentiosus esse, nos talem consuetudinem non habemus, neque Ecclesia Dei. These Passages plainly shew, that the Peace and Unity of the Church was not to suffer in this contention, but that the Bishops and Churches of both Sides were * to be left to their own Customs, and the Practice of their Fathers, as St. Basil speaks in his First Canonical Letter to *Amphilochius*, Bishop of *Iconium*, about the Baptism of the *Novatians*. Indeed, there was no reason why the Bishops should divide Communion, and break the Unity of the Episcopal College in this Controversy; because, *First*, both Parties agreed in their Sentiments, of the direful sacrilegious, and damnable Nature of *Heresy* and *Schism*, and particularly of the *Schism* made by the *Novatians*, and *Donatists*. *Secondly*, they both run back, and unravell'd the Successions of their *Antibishops* to Interruptions, *optatus Milev.* in the one, as well as *Cyprian* in the other

* ὅτι οὐ τὸ εἶναι τῶν καὶ ἐκείνων Χῶραν ἐπίσταν.

* *Lit.* 2. P. 36, 37.

A Letter to the Author.

Schism. *Thirdly*, both compared them to *Corah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, and likewise to Adulterers, and looked upon their Ordainers as Traditors. And *lastly*, both asserted, that in those Schisms none could be saved in the ordinary way, without returning to the Church. But then, though they agreed in the charge of Schism, they differed as to the manner of reconciling *Schismaticks*; one side being for Baptizing those again who were Baptized in Schism, because they thought their Baptism to be * *Null*, *Extraneous*, and *Profane*, and that Schismatical Churches were † only like Churches, but were not real Churches, and by consequence, that their Bishops, and Priests, could not Vallydly Baptize, or do any other Priestly Act. Therefore they had one way of reconciling Penitents, who had been Baptized in the Church, when they returned to it from the Schism, and another of re-

* *Cypr. Epist. 71, 72, 73. Edit. Oxon.*

† *Cyprianus Iubaiano. Quando ad nos non omnino pertineat, quid Hostes Ecclesia faciunt, dummodo teneamus ipsi potestatis nostra honorem, & rationis, ac veritatis firmitatem. Nam Novatianus simiarum more, quæ cum Homines non sint, Homines tamen imitantur, vult Ecclesia Catholica auctoritatem sibi, & Honorem vindicare, quando ipse in Ecclesia non sit. imo adhuc insuper contra Ecclesiam Rebells & Hostis extiterit.*

conciling

A Letter to the Author.

conciling those who had been Baptized in the Schism, when they came over to the Church. The former they only looked upon as * *Stray-Sheep*, and as such readmitted them into the Fold barely by imposition of Hands. But they looked upon the latter as *Now Oves*, who did not belong to the Fold, and were not Sheep at all, and therefore determined that they ought to be Baptized in the Holy Catholick Church, that they might become Sheep of her Fold.

The other side on the contrary, though they looked upon those Schismatical Churches not to belong to the *Holy Catholick Church*, but to be extraneous to it, and alienated from it, yet they looked upon them as Parts, though as factious, sacrilegious Parts of the Universal Church, which were guilty of the highest breach of

* Quod nos quoque hodie observamus, ut quos constat hic Baptizatos esse, & a nobis ad Hæreticos transisse, si postmodum peccato suo cognito, & errore digesto, ad veritatem & Matricem veniat, satis sit in Penitentiam Manum imponere; ut quia ovis fuerat, hanc Ovem ac alienatam & errabundam in Ovile suum Pastor recipiat, si autem quis ab Hæreticis venit, Baptizatus in Ecclesia prius non fuit sed alienus in totum, & profanus venit, Baptizandus est, ut Ovis fiat, quia una est aqua in Ecclesia sancta, qua Oves faciat. Cyprian; Epist. ad Quintum.

Charity,

A Letter to the Author.

Charity, and compared them to the * Vessels of dishonour in the House of God. I say, they looked upon them as Parts of the Universal Church, in the most extended sense of the Word as it comprehends Good, and Bad, Sound and Corrupt, Orthodox, and Hæretical, Pure, and Adulterous Churches, Churches under, and Churches free from the charge of Schism, and as Members of the Universal Church in the largest sense they also looked upon them as *real* Churches, and the Ministrations of their Bishops, and Priests, and the Sacraments they Administred, as *good in themselves*, though *unprofitable*, because, both Givers, and Receivers, wanted Charity, as being divided from the Unity of the Church. This *St. August.* inculcates again and again of † Schismatical Baptism,

* August. Donatistis Epist. 166. *Perire vos non vult Deus in sacrilega discordia alienatos a Matre vestra Catholica, Contra Donatist. Lib. 1. Qui sepe separationis aperto Sacrilegio manifesti sunt; Eos tamen a Sacrilegio Schismatis revocat.*

† August. in Evang. Johan. Tract 6. *Es potest fieri, ut aliquis habeat Baptismum præter columbam: ut prosit ei Baptismus, præter columbam non potest — docet nos columba, respondet enim de capite Domini, dicens, Baptismum habes, charitatem autem, qua Ego Gemo non habes. Quid est hoc, nequit, Baptismum habeo, charitatem non habeo. Sacramentum habeo, Charitatem non. Noli clamare, ostende mihi quomodo habeat charitatem, qui dividit unitatem. ego, in-*
where

A Letter to the Author.

where he defends the *Validity of it in it self*. And as Martyrdom out of the Unity is unprofitable to Salvation, so he saith, Baptism is. The Fathers of the *Latin Church*, particularly the *Africans*, in St. *Augustin's* time looked upon *Schism*, and the utter violation of Charity in it, as

quit, habeo Baptismum : habes, sed sine charitate nihil tibi prodest. Baptisma quippe aliquid est, & magnum aliquid est propter illum; de quo dictum est, hic est qui Baptizat, sed ne putaras illud quod magnum est tibi aliquid prodesse posse si non fueris in Unitate. — Si Baptismum habes esto in Columba, ne non tibi prosit, quod habes, veni ergo ad columbam dicimus, non ut incipias habere, quod non habebas, sed ut prodesse tibi incipiat, quod habes. Foris enim habebas Baptismum ad perniciem; intus si habueris, incipit prodesse ad salutem. Contra Epist. parmeniani. Lib. 2. aliud est prorsus non habere, aliud perniciose habere, aliud salubriter habere, quicquid non habetur dandum est, cum opus est dari, quod vero perniciose habetur per correctionem depulsa perniciæ agendum est, ut salubriter habeatur. Contra Crescon. Gramm. Lib. 2. Ita vobis & nos dicimus, quem Baptismum vos ignorantes observatis, ejus potestatem vobis nos annunciamus, non ut cum ad nos veneritis alterum accipiat, sed ut eum, qui jam apud vos erat, utiliter accipiat. Contra Donatistas, Lib. 1. Non eis itaque dicimus, nolite dare, sed nolite in Schismate dare. Nec eis quos videntur baptizaturi, dicimus, nolite acciperi, sed nolite in Schismate accipere. — Si postea venire ad Catholicam cogitat, quia certus est ibi prodesse Sacramentum, quod alibi accipi quidem potest, prodesse autem non potest. — In Ecclesia Baptismum recte accipi, — Non autem illic (apud Donatistas) recte accipi. Augustin de Bapt. contra Donatistas, Lib. 4. Ecclesia paradiso comparata indicat nobis, posse quidem ejus Baptismum Homines etiam foris accipere, sed salutem beatitudinis extra eam ne-

A Letter to the Author.

an impediēt Cause, which hinder'd the descent, and the reception of the Holy Spirit upon the Baptized in Schism, and their receiving the *Grace of the Sacrament*, which only could make the Sacrament effectual to Salvation; and upon the whole, Sir, I cannot but observe, that the difference between the *Nullity & Inutility* of Schismatical Baptism is not very great, if it be considered, that those Words are so nearly allyed to one another, that in the *Civil Law*, the Latter is often used to signifie the Former, so *inutilis Stipulatio* signifies a void Bargain, and *inutiliter testari* to make a *Will* that is Void, or *no Will*. And so the *Inanis* of St. Cyprian, and *Inutilis* of St. Augustin, let them differ as they will, are both so terrible, that either of them methinks should fright *Schismatics* from the sad State they are in, to

minem vel percipere, vel tenere. — Eos (Hæreticos) doceamus, quod ex unitate habent, non valere ad salutem, nisi ad eandem venerint unitatem. — Salus (inquit) extra Ecclesiam non est; quis negat? Et ideo quacunque ipsius Ecclesiæ habentur extra Ecclesiam non valent ad salutem, sed aliud est non habere, aliud non utiliter habere. De Unit. Eccles. Sacramenta eadem sunt, sed non profunt, quia cum illi recta sint, ipsi perversi sunt. — Accipiat vinculum pactis, quod non habebat, sine quo illi prodesse non potest Baptisma quos habebat. — Baptismus autem in eo, qui justitiam non habet, esse potest, sed non potest prodesse.

betake

A Letter to the Author.

betake themselves to the Ark and Sanctuary of the Church, and be reconciled toher, either by reiterated Baptism, as St. Cyprian saith many Thousands were in his time, or only by *Imposition of Hands*, which afterwards obtained in the *Latin Church*. Wherefore, Sir, I agree with you, that the manner of admitting, and reconciling such Penitent Schismatics, as returned from the *Novatians* and *Donatists*, ought not now to be matter of dispute. For the conversion of such is the main Point, and the manner of admitting them ought to be left to the custom of Churches.

Here I cannot but observe to you, with what † *Lenity and Gentleness* the Church of *Africa* treated the *Donatists*. * *She allowed their Ordinations as well as Baptisms*, and in a Diocess where there was a Church-Bishop, and a Donatist Bishop, * *She offered a Partition of such a Diocess, in which the Senior of them should divide, and the Junior choose.* * *She also received the Clergy-men among the Donatists upon their Conversion, to the same honour that they enjoyed among the Donatists, * and also admitted those who were Baptized in*

† *African Code in the Clergy-man's Vade mecum. Part 2. Can. 66. * Can 69. * Can. 118. * Can. 68. * Can. 47. 57.*
their

A Letter to the Author.

their Infancy by the *Donatists*, not only into the Church but also to the *Ministry of the Altar*, when they were converted, and had received *Imposition of Hands*. Without Conversion and Admission into the Unity, to which the Church Bishops invited them by these Concessions and Honours, there could be no reunion, or making the Two into one Communion again. But the *Donatist* Bishops having Numbers, and Strength on their Side refused, and slighted all the Offers of the Church, and so added Obstinacy and Contempt to their Sin. * *St. Augustin* tells us they were so proud & uncondescending, that they would not come to any pacifick Conference with them, (*till forc'd by the Emperour*) but prided themselves in their Schism. Sir, I have referred you above to the Canons of the *African Code*, as they are abridged in the Second Part of the *Vade Mecum*, because I had a mind to notify that excellent and useful Book to the

* Exhort ad Concord. Eccles. Epist. 166. Nihil in nos aliquando probare potuistis, vestri Episcopi conventi a nobis, nunquam pacifice cum nobis conferre voluerunt, quasi fugientes cum peccatoribus loqui. Quis ferat istam superbiam, quasi Paulus Apostolus non contulerit cum peccatoribus, & cum valde sacrilegis. Quasi ipse Dominus non cum Iudæis a quibus crucifixus est, Sermones de lege habuerit. — ut intelligatos istos ideo nobiscum nolle conferre, quia causam suam perditam norunt!

World,

A Letter to the Author.

World, for which the Author deserves great praise and thanks. But Sir, nevertheless I desire you, who understand *Latin*, to read them at large in that Language, in *Justel's Bibliotheca Juris Canonici veteris*, Tom. 1. and when you have leasure the Conferences at *Carthage* between the *Catholicks*, and the *Donatists* in *Optatus Milevitanus's* Works, or rather *St. Augustins Breviculum* of them in the 7th Vol. of his Works.

I have observed to you in the beginning of my Letter, that as there never was any Church founded, but *in* and *with* Episcopacy, so no Sect ever assumed the Title of a Church, till they had a pretended rightful Bishop, before the time of the Reformation. So essential did all Christians (till that time) think Bishops to the Church as a Society, according to that of *St. Cyprian* in * his 66. Epist. "*Illi sunt Ecclesia Plebs Sacerdoti adunata, & Pastori suo Grex adherens. Unde scire debes Episcopum in Ecclesia esse, & Ecclesiam in Episcopo, & si qui cum Episcopo non sint, in Ecclesia non esse. A Church is composed of the People united to the Bishop, and the*

* Edit. Oxon.

A Letter to the Author.

“ Flock adhering to their Pastour, therefore
“ you ought to know, that the Bishop is in the
“ Church, and the Church in the Bishop; so
“ that they who are not with the Bishop are
“ not in the Church.

This is exactly according to the Apostolical Doctrine of St. Ignatius. But, Sir, to shew you, or rather the Reader, that all Sects, who desired to be accounted Churches, were headed by Bishops as Principles of Unity, I need but instance in the *Montanists*, those ancient *Camisars*, who being condemned by the whole Catholick Church, formed themselves into a seperate Church, over which they pretended to set Bishops and Presbyters, whom they chose out of the *Prophetical Order*, as in the time of the Apostles; by the *Immediate Call* of God, I mean by the exprefs designation of the *Holy Ghost*, or a visible manifestation of the Divine Union resting upon them. They also set up a Primat in the same manner over their New Church, which they declared to be the most perfect that ever had been on the Face of the Earth. This, Sir, you may see in the History of *Montanism*, in One of the *Three Discourses* newly Published against our pretended new Prophets, to which I refer you; and it is natural to conclude, that they either had no notion of a Church without

without *Bishops*, or that they feared to be detected as false Prophets for rejecting the Apostolical Order, and therefore according to the practise of the Catholick Church unto that time, from which they durst not depart, they founded their New Churches *in* and *with* Episcopacy; of all which they looked upon the Church of *Pepuza*, a City of *Perygia*, to be the Mother, as *Hierusalem* was of the Catholick Church.

My next Instance shall be in *Novatian*, the Founder of the *Novatian* Schism, who got himself to be Ordained by Three unworthy Bishops in such an indirect and scandalous manner, as you may read in the 43d Ch. of the 6th Book of the Ecclesiastical History of *Eusebius*. According to this received Principle of the necessity of a Bishop to a Church, most of the Troubles in the Ancient Churches were not for *pulling down Bishops*, but about *setting of them up*, that every Party might have a Bishop for a pretended Principle of Unity; and so the *Novatians*, though they were divided from the Church for a long time, yet maintained an Episcopal Succession, that they might in all Places have the Form and Fashion, and Appearance of a Church. Thus the Party of the *Donatists* in *Africa*, so called from *Donatus* a *Cafis Nigris*, who began

d

to

A Letter to the Author.

to trouble the Church in the time of *Men- succ*
surius, *Primate of Carthage*, after his Death from
set up *Majorinus* against *Cacilian*, his next whi
lawful Successor, who had been truly E sepe
lected and Consecrated into his Place a fac
They knew the People of that City would again
not follow them without a Bishop, and thag
having by that means formed a mighty again
Party there, they were headed by * those done
other Bishops who condemned *Cacilian* have
and set up *Majorinus* against him, - and the
thereby formed the most deplorable Schism mora
that ever was in any of the Churches in th
Old. The People then had no notion of shoul
Church without a Bishop, (unless in a vacant Dona
Church where the Altar continues) much thew
less of a Church set up against *Episcopacy*. For Chur
had they thought that a Church could be divid
without a Bishop, and Episcopal Successor be ex
the Misleaders of them at any time in *Maxi*
Heresy or *Schism*, need not have taken *ix.* a
much pains, or used so many indirect Art But
to be made Bishops, but have set up *Pre* the St
byterian Churches, which was so contrari was
to *Catholick* Practice, and the *comm*ts gre
Principle of Bishops being the Apostles to rel
Successors, and Principle of Unity in the the P
respective Churches, that they either *avian*
ver thought of doing it, or if they did Moun
they thought they could never do it wi

* *Henricus vates de Schismate Donatistarum. Cap. 2*
succel

A Letter to the Author.

Men success. So in the famous sub division
ath from the Church among the *Donatists*,
next which separated from them as they had
E. separated from the Church, * *Maximianus*
ace a factious Deacon, was set up by them,
ould against *Primiannus* their Bishop of Car-
and *rhage*, as they at first set up *Majorinus*
ghty against *Cacilian*: which they need not have
hose done, if a Church without a Bishop would
ilian have served their turn. This Sect of
and the *Maximianists* is mentioned in that me-
chismorable Canon of the *African Code*, where-
nes of the Fathers Ordained, that Legates
of should be sent to preach Peace to the
acan *Donatists*, both Clergy and People, and to
much shew them, that they departed from the
cy. For Church as unjustly as the *Maximianists* di-
uld be divided from them, and that they should also
cessor be exhorted to receive Converts from the
e into *Maximianists*, as the Church did from them,
ken *viz. allowing their Ordination and Baptism*.
Et An But, Sir, to shew those who know not
p Pre the Story, how the Principle of Episcopacy
ontrast was transmitted to latter Ages, and kept
commits ground to the 15th Century, permit me
apost to relate the Opinion and Proceedings of
in the the *Presbyters* of those *Bohemians* and *Mo-*
ther *navians*, who in persecution retiring to a
they di Mountainous Country near *Silesia*, grew
it will

* August. de Gestis cum Emeristo Donatist. Episcop.

A Letter to the Author.

very sollicitous how the People should have the Ministry continued unto them after they were dead. * In this deliberation they had some thoughts, which necessity suggested to them of ordaining other Presbyters to succeed them. But fearing that such Ordinations would not be Legitimate nor defensible, if called in question, at length in the Year 1467. the most eminent among them that were dispersed through *Bohemia* and *Moravia*, met together to the Number of about 70, who addressing themselves to God with Prayers and Tears, beseeched him to shew them if their Purpose were agreeable to his holy Will, and if that were the time for it, and then proceeded in the following manner to know the Will of God by *Lot*. They chose by Suffrages *Nine Men* from among themselves, whom they thought most worthy to be *Bishops*, and having put into the Hands of a Child *Twelve* little Papers folded up, they directed him to distribute them among the *Nine* Persons. Nine of the Papers

* *Ecclesiæ Sclavonica Bohemæ in Gente potissimum radicali Historiola. § 59, 60, 61. sed quassabat animos, utrum, an satis legitima foret Ordinatio, si Presbyter presbyterum crearet; non vero Episcopus? et quomodo talem Ordinationem, si lis moveatur defensuri essent, sive apud alios sive apud suos.*

were
only
the
him
hap
sons
wo
Neg
pass
the
wer
and

T
ven
deli
to
ster
ing
side
via
and
one
ther
kno

Stri
suff

*
*
legiti
cession
Episc
n Un

A Letter to the Author.

were *Blank*, and on the other Three only were written *E S T*, *it is*, to wit, *the Will of God*, which they had begg'd him to discover to them. It might have so happened, that every one of the *Nine Persons* might have got a *Blank Paper*, which would have been a sign to them of the *Negative Will* of God. But it came to pass, that the *Three Written Papers* fell into the Hands of Three among them, who were noted for their Piety, Learning, and Prudence.

These *they embraced with joy, as given unto them from Heaven, and then deliberated about their Consecration. And to that End sent Three of their Ministers to a part of the *Waldenses*, who being banished out of *France*, came to reside in the Confines of *Austria* and *Moravia*. To these they related their sad State, and having asked their Counsel, *Stephanus*, one of their Bishops, calling to him another Bishop, and some Ministers, he made known to them the purity of their Doctrine, the grievous Persecutions they had suffered in *France* and *Italy*, and * *the law-*

* *Ibid* §. 60.

* *Cumque dicti Waldenses legitimos se habere Episcopos legitimamque, & non interruptam ab Apostolis usque successionem affirmarent, creaverunt tres e nostrorum Ministris Episcopos, &c. In præfat. Ante Rationem discipline in Unitate Fratrum Bohemorum.*

A Letter to the Author.

ful uninterrupted Succession of their Bishops from the first Plantation of Christianity among them to that time. To them therefore the *Bohemian* Ministers, Elected by Lot, were sent to be Consecrated Bishops, after which they resolved to unite with the *Waldenses*, who were suddenly scattered by a new Persecution, in which, *Stephan*. their Bishop suffered Martyrdom, being inhumanely burnt at *Vienna*. † *Joh. Amos Comenius* was the last Bishop of this *Bohemian* Succession, who lived to see the † utter ruine of the *Bohemian* and *Moravian* Churches, occasioned by their impatience * under the *Cross*, in taking up *Arms* against their Lawful Sovereign, and setting up another against him.

But having mentioned *Colluthus* above, as an Usurper upon the Episcopal Office in presuming to Ordain *Presbyters*, give me leave to tell the Story, because, as Lawyers speak, it is a *Book-case*, which shews the Invalidity of *Presbyterian Ordination*. This *Colluthus*, a *Presbyter* of *Alexandria*, took

† *Joh. Amos. Comenei Dedicatorium Alloquium. p. 8, 9, 10.*

* *Hoc egerunt ut eas exquisitis divexationibus ad impatientiam, & dehinc ad Arma, proritarent.*

† *Eo res deducta est, ut intra Bohemiam, & Moraviam nullum amplius Evangelicis Templum, nulla Schola, nullum privatum Religionis Exercitium. &c.*

upon

A Letter to the Author.

upon him in opposition to his Bishop to Ordain certain *Presbyters*, and among the rest one called * *Ischyra*, who accused *Macarius*, a *Presbyter* of *Athanasias*, for breaking the Chalice while he was Administring at the Holy Altar ; and this scandalous Story was one of those which the *Arians* invented, and brought against *Athanasius*, and were all examined, and found to be Lyes by a great † Council, which met at *Alexandria* in the Year of our Lord, 340. As to this particular Story, the Council upon enquiry declared * *First*, that in the Place where the *Holy Cup* was said to be broken by *Macarius*, there was no Church, *Secondly*, nor *Presbyter* there to Administer, nor *Thirdly*, was the Day in which the Fact was said, a Day of Communion, nor *Last* of all was *Ischyra* a Priest, * being only Ordained by *Colluthus*, who dyed a *Presbyter*, and whose *Imposition of Hands* was of no Authority, or Validity, and that, all who were Ordained by him, were Laymen, and communicated in the Assem-

* ποτήριον μυστηρίου.

† Athanasii. Apol. 2.

* Ἀλλ' οὐ μὴδὲν ἢ ὅλως ἐκεῖ πῶς γάρ ; ὅτι μὴτε τὸ πῶς χυσαμένης μὴτε πῶς ἐκεῖ ἐκκλησιᾶς ἀλλὰ μὴτε ὁ καιρὸς μυστηρίου ἦν.

* Ἀλλ' ὅτι ΚΟΛΛΟΥΘΟΣ πρεσβύτερος ἐν ἐπιταφίᾳ, καὶ πᾶσι Χοῖς αὐτῷ γέγονεν ἄχρεος, &c.

A Letter to the Author.

blies as such. To this Testimony of the Church, let me add another of a *Spanish Bishop*, who having fore Eyes at an Ordination of Presbyters only laid his Hands upon them, suffering a Presbyter to read the Words of Ordination. This coming to be debated in the * Second Council of *Sevil*, was, upon mature deliberation, thus determined. *First*, that the Presbyter, had he been alive, should have been censured for his presumption. And *Secondly*, that the Presbyters and Deacons, so Ordained, should be deposed from their Sacred Orders, which they had wrongfully received. This shews, that this Council were of opinion, that *Presbyters* could have no *Essential* Part in Ordination, and therefore, that they are liable to censure, merely for reading the Words of Ordination, which formally constitute a *Presbyter*, or *Deacon*, though with the allowance of his Bishop, who is not supposed to have power to Authorize him to do that, which he only hath Authority to do himself.

Upon what you have Written, P. 57. about the *Form of Baptism*, **In the Name of the Father**, &c. Sir, give me leave to recommend to your perusal, what is written by a very Learned Divine, and

* *Council. Hisp. II. Cap. 5.*

A Letter to the Author.

an old Sufferer for the Church of England,
Mr. Christopher Elderfield in his Book of
Regeneration and Baptism, from P. 183.
to P. 207.

I cannot but declare my consent to what
you have written, P. 133. viz. That sup-
posing it were (as it is not) possible, for the
Church to be deprived at once of all her Bi-
shops, it would be our duty, as well as safety,
in that Destitution, to Wait and Pray, and
hope for a new Revelation of the Will of
God, rather than to take upon our selves to
make Bishops, for which we have no Authority.
And I concur with you also in your Con-
clusion, P. 134. That no Doctrine whatso-
ever, can be proved false, [or as I beg leave
to add ought to be rejected] because Numbers of
Men may be involved in the sad Consequences
that arise from it. To which let me also add,
more especially, when they are involved in
them, contrary to their Knowledge, or by
their own wilful Ignorance, or Mistake,
or by Worldly Interest, and evil Passions.
This, Sir, will appear plainly, if we consider
the received Principles of Christianity, which
are either Speculative, or Practical, that
is, either Doctrines or Commands. By
the Speculative Principles, I mean all the
received Doctrines of Faith, which we
are bound to believe in order to Salvation,
and

A Letter to the Author.

and by the *Practical*, those, which oblige us to some *Practical Duty*, which are again of three Sorts, *Moral, Ritual, and Political*. And there are none of these Principles, which some Men among us, in this Age of *Destruative Latitude*, will not give up, or strive to bend, and relax, for fear, or favour, when great Numbers of Men, especially of Men in power, are concerned in the Consequences of them. To instance in one of the *Speculative Principles*: You cannot but know, that some do not like our Preaching up the Doctrine of *Christ's being God*, or, *God of God*, of the same *Essence*, or *Substance* with the Father, and the Belief of it, as necessary to Salvation, because so many *Arians*, and *Socinians*, and other unexcusable Unbelievers are involved in the dangerous Consequences of that Doctrine; and for their sakes, and, it may be, secretly for their own, they rack their Inventions to find out new, loose, and Evasive Expositions of that Fundamental Mystery to Christianity, and express them in odd uncertain Terms unknown to all *Antiquity*, and as different in Sense, as in Sound from the Language of the *Catholick Church*. I have said, *inexcusable* Unbelievers, though these Gentlemen of large thoughts, and pretended large

A Letter to the Author.

large Charity would excuse them, because the Mystery is incomprehensible, and the manner of the thing, as taught by the Catholick Church, unconceivable by Humane Understanding: But let me say, no otherwise unconceivable by us, than some *Natural Mysteries* are, which though we cannot conceive, yet we believe. They will tell us in behalf of these Unbelievers, that Mens Minds are as different as their Faces, that our Brains, and the Cells in them, are of different make, and that all Men cannot believe alike. But, Sir, to shew the Vanity of such Apologies, let us suppose, that some of our Countrymen were Trading among a People very remote from the Sea, imagine under the foot of Mount *Caucasus*, and had told them, that the Waters of the River, which run through the Capital City of *England*, did twice every day, and sometimes oftner, run backwards up the same Channel, down which the Stream had run not long before, and that the *King* of that People, as well as the People, wondring at this relation should send Letters to the *Queen* to desire her Majesty, that if it was true, she would be pleased to confirm the Truth of it by an Answer with her *Royal Seal*, and that, after he received her *Majesty's* most Authentick

A Letter to the Author.

thentick Letter, should nevertheless declare he would not believe *the thing*, because he could not conceive the manner of it, nor how it could possibly be done, and thereupon also did brand the First Relators of this unconceivable natural Myſtery, as *Lyars*, and then baniſh them out of his Dominions. Suppoſing all this, Sir, do you think it were reaſonable, to make an Apology for ſuch a Princes obſtinate incredulity, who, upon the Authority of ſuch Testimonies, would not believe the thing, because it was not only above his Underſtanding, but that of all the Philoſophers in his Kingdom. I ſay, would it be reaſonable, for ſuch a Prince, and his Philoſophers, to diſ-believe, or doubt of that thing after ſuch undoubted Humane Authority for the truth of it, or for others to Palliat, or Excuse their obſtinate Unbelief, because Men's Minds are not all alike, and their Brains of different make. Sir, I wiſh the Gentlemen, for whoſe ſake I have made this comparison, would conſider it, and no longer, under pretence of *Universal Charity*, and the *different Features of Minds*, write in ſuch manner of the great Myſtery of our Religion, as to confirm our Doubters, or Unbelievers in their Scepticiſm, or Unbelief, and thereby give them occaſion

A Letter to the Author.

sion to reject it as uncertain or false, rather than be involv'd in the dreadful consequence of their Unbelief, should it be, as it certainly is, a Divine Truth.

Then as to the Practical Principles, which I call Precepts, or *Commands*, they are also as necessary to be *observed* as the other are to be *believed*; and if I may so speak, are as dear to God as any Article of Faith, and yet there is none of them, which some Men of *Latitude* among us will not soften, and trim up into another sense, to please the Transgressors of them to their Eternal Ruin.

Thus, Sir, that very Sect, which not only neglects, but despises the Two Sacraments as Temporary Institutions, or Ritual Ordinances, appointed only for the *Infant-State* of the Church, are not only allowed the Title of Christians, but reckoned in the ordinary State of Salvation by some free thinkers in the *Broad Way*, which leadeth to Destruction. And then, as to the *Political Doctrines*, or Principles, relating to the Government of the Church, though it was the consentient Belief of all Christians for Fifteen Hundred Years, that Bishops were the Successors of the Apostles, & as such only have power to Ordain Ministers in the Church, yet have we
Men

A Letter to the Author.

Men, and Men of no ordinary Figures in the Church, that not only never Preach this Doctrine themselves, but do not love that others should Preach it, or Instruct the Youth in it, because say they, *it Unchurches the Foreign Churches*. But, Sir, in the Name of God, is it this received Principle of the *Catholick Church*, that Unchurches Foreign Churches, or do they Unchurch themselves in continuing wilful Transgressors of it? As not to speak more of the *Moral Principles* of Christianity, is it for instance, the Doctrine of Sobriety, or Justice, or Temperance, or Purity, or Humility, that damns so many Millions of Christians, or do they damn themselves by their wilful violation of them? The Positive Laws of God are all Sacrosanct, *especially those he hath Ordain'd for Government*, and he will in no wise excuse the wilful Neglect, Contempt, or Transgression of them; but every such Transgression and Disobedience against the Polity of the Christian Theocracy, let the Number of Offenders be never so great shall receive a just Recompence of Reward. And therefore judge, Sir, who act most like Primitive Christians, and the faithful Servants of Christ, *those*, who in all Meekness, and Charity, set this received Principle

A Letter to the Author.

ciple concerning the *Oecumenion Theocracy* of the Mystical *Israel*, the Necessity of Conformity and Obedience, and the Consequences of Disobedience to it before the *other Churches*, or those, who sooth and flatter them in their Errour, because they are *whole Nations*, though most of them have abandoned the Divine Order of Bishops, purely for Human Reasons of State, and particularly because they have alienated the Revenues, by which they were maintained. Yet, Sir, the same Persons, who had rather this *Principle* were suppress'd, than that those Nations should, as they speak, be *Unchurched* by it, would, at least many of them, make no difficulties to *Unchurch* lesser Bodies of Christians by it, and let the Consequences which arise from it, have their full force upon a few, though the Transgression of the *Principle*, and the Consequences of the Transgression equally affect a great, as well as a small Number, and condemn whole Nations of Christians as much, and as effectually as single Men. But these Gentlemen should consider that they are the Multitudes and great Numbers that will be condemned at the Day of Judgment. Furthermore, Sir, You know, what indispensable Obligations, lye upon all Christians, and Christians

A Letter to the Author.

ftian Nations, to *profefs the Faith once delivered to the Saints*, and to contend earnestly for it, and accordingly how carefully it was guarded; and how zealously contended for against all Hereticks, who from the Beginning opposed it, or any part of it: and therefore, if we must believe and contend for *Divine Revelations*, which have always been opposed, why should we not as zealously observe and contend for that *Divine Institution*, which was never opposed for 1500 Years, I mean, that Form of Government, which all Christianity received and Practised for so many Ages, as that only Ecclesiastical Polity, which was appointed by Christ to continue unto the End of the World.

Sir, I have taken occasion from your Assertion to say thus much in behalf of *Episcopacy*, as a *received Principle of Christianity*, and from thence to shew, how it concerns all our Divines, especially of the Episcopal Order, to set the dangerous consequences of rejecting it before the *Foreign Churches*, and thereupon to invite, encourage, and exhort, nay to Conjure them in the Name of Christ, to join the Apostolical Government to the Apostolical Faith of the Church, that thereby they may become wholly Pure and Primitive, and

not

A Letter to the Author.

not only in part, but in whole, as we are,
and all Christian Nations ought to be. This
surely, would better become the Men of
higher Stations and Characters in the
Church, than, in sinful complaisance to Fo-
reign Churches, to condemn Books of most
excellent instruction for the younger sort
at School, because they teach them, that
Bishops were Successors to the Apostles in the
Church; and only have power to ordain, and
send forth Labourers into God's Vineyard.
These Gentlemen surely forget, that
is the nature of the Church, as a *Sect*,
consists in Doctrines; So, as she is a *Soci-*
ety, it consists in that frame of Polity which
God hath Ordained for the Government
hereof. wherefore, instead of condem-
ning, they should rather recommend all
such Books, as Instruct the *Laitie*, Young,
or Old, in Primitive Christianity, and en-
courage them to read all such Tracts, and
Discourses in their own or any other
Tongue, as will give them true Views
of the State of the Primitive Church in
the Best and Purest Ages, and of the Man-
ners of the Primitive Christians in them;
and were this diligently done by the Cler-
gy, the Church would soon find great
benefit, and God receive much glory by it,
and the *Stray-Sheep* of our Countries, after
your

e

A Letter to the Author.

your Example, would return in Flocks to
her Folds.

Your *enquiring Genius*, and the Providence of God led you to read such Books, and his Blessing upon Reading of them made you see, and Correct your Errours, and though you have an advantage above most others of the *Laity* in understanding *Latin*, yet there is already a great deal written in *English*, to let Pious, and Inquisitive Persons into the knowledge of the Primitive Church, and Primitive Christianity, such as Dr. *Cave's* Primitive Christianity; and his Learned, and elaborate Lives of the Fathers; *Fleury* of the Manners, and Behaviour of the Primitive Christians, turned into *English*; The Ecclesiastical Historians in a Noble new Edition, Illustrated with Maps by the Learned *Welles*; The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers by the Learned Bishop *W...* from whom we wait for another Edition. The Learned Mr. *Bingham's* *Origines Ecclesiasticae*, or, *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, worthy to be read by all Men; The second Part of the Clergy-man's *Vade-Mecum*, commended above; Mr. *Reres's* Apology of the Antient Christians, for which he well deserves the Thanks and Praise of all Lovers of Primitive Christianity, who cannot but

delight

* As
sence of

A Letter to the Author.

delight to hear them speak in our Language the same things, with the same United Force of Wit and Reason, and with the same Charms of Eloquence that they did in their own. To these let me add the Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles by the late Bishop Beveridge, which the Learned World desires, and from which we may expect nothing but what is Primitive. There are other excellent Pens at Work in Books of the like nature with these, and I cannot but hope that God hath excited the Spirit of cultivating the more early Ecclesiastical Antiquities, in mercy to his Church. I could name several other English Tracts upon several Subjects, full of Primitive Christian Divinity, were such a *Bibliotheca* fit for this Place. And besides those which are written in English, there are many excellent Pieces of the same kinds written in French, as Du Pin's *Nouvelle Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques*, Translated into English; Tillamont's *Memoires, Pour Servir à l'histoire Ecclesiastique*, which also deserves to be Translated; the Works of St. Cyprian in French, which I cannot but wish that all Englishmen, who are not versed in La-

* As the Principles of the Cyprianick Age, and the defence of it, &c.

A Letter to the Author.

tin, but understand that Language, would carefully read. Were our People exercised in such Writings as these, and their Minds seasoned with the Ancient Doctrines and Principles which are in them, we should soon see the Spirit of Primitive Christianity begin to revive among them, in the Soundness and Orthodoxy of their Faith; in the Piety of their Practice; in their Zeal for the Divine Institutions; in their Love and Reverence of the Clergy; and in their Prayers & Endeavours, for supplying whatever is wanting to make the Church of England in the Sanctity of her Clergy, and People, and in the strictness of her Discipline and every other thing, as Pure, and Perfect and Venerable as the Primitive Church.

Sir, your Book, had I time to write them, would furnish me with matter for more useful Reflections, and Observations; but these are sufficient to shew you how much Diligence and Delight, it has been read over by

Your Friend, and Servant,

GEO. HICKES

T H

THE CONTENTS

- A** Preliminary Discourse of the Various
Opinions of the Fathers, concerning
Rebaptizations & Invalid Baptisms, with
Remarks. Page 1.
- St. Cyprian, and his Colleagues Opinion of
Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms.* 1.
- The Opinion of Stephen, Bishop of Rome,
and his Party, concerning such Baptisms.* 2.
- The Arguments of the Stephanians for their
Validity.* 2.
- The Cyprianists Reasons for their Invali-
dity.* 3.
- St. Cyprian's Christian Humility and Cha-
rity towards his Antagonists.* 9.
- The contrary Temper of Stephen Bishop of
Rome.* 9.
- St. Athanasius rejects Heretical Baptism.* 10.
- St. Basil's Opinion of Heretical and Schis-
matical Baptism.* 11.
- The Council of Eliberis, allows of Lay-
Baptism in Case of Necessity, but with a
particular Proviso.* 12.
- The Council of Arles, determines the famous
Dispute about Rebaptizing Hereticks.* 12.

The CONTENTS.

<i>But nothing concerning Lay-Baptism.</i>	Page 12	The I
<i>St. Augustin's Argument against the Dona-</i>		tor.
<i>rists, not conclusive for the Validity of</i>		Axiom
<i>Lay-Baptism.</i>	16.	
<i>Nor His Arguments against the Cyprianists.</i>	19, 20.	
<i>The Author's Case and Dissatisfaction.</i>	25.	I. Ez
<i>His Short Answer to some who would persuade</i>		Inf
<i>him, that the Baptism Administred to him,</i>		cess
<i>in Opposition to Episcopacy, was good, be-</i>		Coro
<i>cause done in his Infancy.</i>	26.	det
<i>His Thoughts about the Dispute in St. Cy-</i>		Inf
<i>prian's time.</i>	26.	ry
<i>His Resolution however not to meddle with</i>		II. I
<i>it.</i>	28.	of
<i>His Design in this Discourse.</i>	28, 29.	N
		P
		N
		on
		ti
		Cor
		b
		of
		I

The Introduction.

Of the Nature and Obligation of Divine
Positive Institutions of Religion.

Definitions of

<i>A Divine Positive Institution.</i>	31	III.
<i>The Essential Parts of such an Institution.</i>	32	n
<i>An Invalid Act.</i>	32	f
<i>Supernatural Advantages annex'd to such an</i>		r
<i>Institution.</i>	32.	I
		c

The CONTENTS.

ge 12.	<i>The Divine Authority of the Administra-</i>	
Dona-	<i>tor.</i>	Page 32.
ity of	<i>Axioms or Undeniable Maxims.</i>	33.

Propositions.

25. I. *Every Essential Part of a Divine Positive Institution is of equal Obligation and Necessity.* 34.
- d, be. Corollary, *Hence no Humane Authority can determine one Essential Part of such an Institution, to be more excellent or necessary than another.* 36.
26. Cy. II. *If an Act (said to be done in pursuance of a Divine Positive Institution) be wholly Null and Void, for want of One Essential Part of the Institution; 'tis also as much Null and Void, when it wants but any other one Essential Part of the same Institution.* 36.
28. 29. Corollary, *Hence ther's no such thing as a but partial Invalidity, 'tis entire, for want of any One Essential Part of a Positive Institution.* 37.
31. 32. 32. III. *We have no Reason to expect the Supernatural Benefits annex'd to a Divine Positive Institution, without endeavouring to conform to every one of its Essential Parts, when we know that we have not yet conform'd to them.* 37.
32. Th

The CONTENTS.

The Essay.

Of the Nature and Benefits of Christian Baptism. 39.

'Tis no other than a Divine Positive Institution. 40.

Consequently our Obligation to receive it, and from the Persons by whom 'tis order'd to be Administred, is wholly and only founded upon the Divine Command. 41.

Prop. I. That the Divine Authority of the Administrator is an Essential Part of Christian Baptism. 42.
Prov'd

1st. From God's making the Divine Authority of the Administrator, to be an Essential part of his own Positive Institution under the Mosaic Law. 44.

2^{dly}, By the Example of our Saviour's not taking upon him to Minister in such Holy things till he was particularly and externally Commissioned for that purpose. 47.

3^{dly}, From the Words of Institution of Christian Baptism. 49.

4^{thly}, From the Design and Benefits thereof. 59.

5^{thly}, From the constant Practice of the true and pretended Ministers of the Christian Church. 64.

6^{thly}, From the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of England. 66.

Propo.

The CONTENTS.

Prop. II. *That the Divine Authority of the Administrator of Baptism is as much obliging and necessary to us, as the Water and Form of Administring in the Name of the Trinity.* Page 74.

Corollary, *Hence no Humane Authority can dispense with the Omission of the Divine Authority of him who Administers.* 75.

Prop. III. *Whosoever affirms Baptism to be wholly Null and Invalid, for want of either Water, or the Form of Administring in the Name of the Trinity; ought for the same reason to acknowledge Baptism as much Null and Invalid, when it wants only the Divine Commission of the Administrator.* 76.

Corollary, *Hence the Invalidity of such Baptisms as are Administred by unauthoriz'd Persons cannot be partial but entire.* 78.

Therefore Imposition of the Bishop's Hands is not sufficient to supply the defects of such Baptisms. 79.

The Church of England, in her Office of Confirmation, appointed only for validly Baptiz'd Persons, gives us not the least intimation of any such efficacy in the Imposition of the Bishop's Hands. 81.

The unavoidable mischiefs that must follow upon allowing any Validity in Lay Baptism. 83.

It will be then in vain for the True Ministers of Christ, to sell the People of the damning nature of Schism. 84.

Prop.

The CONTENTS.

Prop. IV. *He who knows himself to have been invalidly baptiz'd by one who never had the Divine Commission, can have no just grounds to expect the Supernatural benefits answer'd to the One true Christian Baptism, till he has done his utmost for the obtaining of them, by endeavouring to procure that One Baptism from the Hands of a Divinely Authoriz'd Minister.* P. 86.

The great danger they incur, who know themselves to have been Invalidly Baptiz'd by a Lay-man, in opposition to, and Rebellion against those who were truly Authoriz'd to Baptize. 87.

It highly concerns those who are ignorant of this, to undeceive themselves, if possible, that they may be sure of the Validity of their Baptism. 88.

Objections Answered.

I. *Christ in the Words of Institution, do's not in exprefs terms, confine Baptism to the Administration of his Apostles and their Successors, so, as that none can Administer True Baptism but they, and such only as they shall Authorize.* 90.

II. *This Doctrine confines the Efficacy of the Sacraments to the Divine Authority of the Administrator, insomuch, that if an uncommission'd Person Ministers, he Administers no Sacraments at all.* 92.

III. *Who*

The CONTENTS.

- III. *Who has this Divine Authority is in Dispute, and consequently the Foundation of Baptism is very precarious and uncertain.* Page 97.
- The Diligent and Industrious, who live in conscientious Communion with the True Church, need not be in suspense about this Dispute, and why.* 97.
- This Divine Right of Administring, is in Episcopacy only* 99.
- The Authors who have abundantly prov'd this, referr'd to.* 101.
- IV. *'Tis uncharitable to deny the Validity of the Baptism of Foreign Churches, and some among our selves.* 102.
- The Author's charity for some who are invincibly ignorant.* 104.
- V. *The Example of Zipporah Moses's Wife who Circumcis'd her Son.* 105.
- VI. *Fieri non debet; factum valet; i. e. it is not lawful to be done, yet being done 'tis Valid.* 107.
- VII. *The Council of Eliberis, Anno 305. & the Church of England, at the begining of the Reformation, allow'd of Lay-Baptism in a Case of necessity, as the Church of Rome do's to this Day.* 109.
- The Church of England saw Reasons afterwards not to give liberty for such Baptisms, and therefore now in her Liturgy requires*

The CONTENTS.

- requires Baptism even in Cases of Necessity to be Administred by a Lawful Minister.* Page 112.
- St. Cyprian, and Bishop Taylor's Opinion, if the Custom of such Lay-Baptism had continued.* 113.
- VIII. *Of the Censers that were Hallowed by the Two Hundred and Fifty Princes sinful Offering of Incense.* 115.
- The Subject of this Essay the Author believes to be a First Principle of Christianity.* 119.
- The great danger of not Asserting and Vindicating it.* 119.
- His short Address and Request to the Clergy.* 119.
- And Caution to the Usurpers of the Sacred Office.* 120.
- His Prayer for the Church and Clergy.* 121.
- Appendix.**
- The Reason for making this Addition in Answer to*
Further Objections 123
- IX. *Of Unchurching the Foreign Reform'd Churches, who are without Episcopal Ordination, this the Objector says is contrary to the Concessions of many Episcopal Divines of the Church of England.* 123.
- The Author's charitable Thoughts of many Foreigners.* 126.
- The Episcopal Divines spoken of, have by their Concessions, contradicted the Doctrine and avowed Practice of the Church of England.* 128.
- A comparison of a True Priest of the Tribe of Aaron, undertaking to defend the Validity of the Priesthood which Jeroboam had set up.* 129.
- No Case of Necessity can of it self Authorize us to assume the great Office of mediating between God and Man.* 131.

Episcopacy

The CONTENTS.

Episcopacy cannot be utterly extinct. Page 133.

But if it were, 'tis safer for us to wait and hope for some new Revelation of God's Will, to appoint Ministers, than take it upon our selves.

133.

X. *Of the Nullity of their Orders and Ministrations who have not been Baptiz'd, and yet have been Episcopally Ordain'd to the Ministry.* 135.

An Essay towards an Answer to this Objection. 135.
But with submission to the better Reasons of the Clergy. 146.

The Author's final and determinate Answer to the Objection. 146.

XI. *Of the Powers of the Hierarchy, to relax Stated Rules in Cases of Necessity, and of Confirming and Ratifying by Chrism or Imposition of Hands, such Heretical, Schismatical, or Mimical Baptisms, as are done without, nay and against the consent of the Hierarchy.* 148.

Our Hierarchical Powers have provided no Act of Confirmation of such Baptisms. 149.

The Powers of the Hierarchy are for ever limited (in things fundamental) to the Canon of the Holy Scriptures. 149.

Their hazard in dispensing with things fundamental, and our insecurity in such dispensations. 150, 151.

If the external Rite of such Baptisms does not confer Spiritual Graces, &c. as the Objection supposes, then no after act of the Bishop, can confirm those Baptisms; but the external Rite must be perform'd by a Lawful Minister. 152.

The ill use that Hereticks and Schismaticks may make of the Churches suppos'd power to License Lay-men to Baptize in Cases of Extremity. 155.

The

The CONTENTS.

The Benefit of asserting the Ministration of the Priesthood to be Essential to the Administration of Christian Sacraments. Page 157.

XII. *Of the Church of the Jews changing the First Posture of Standing to eat the Paschal Lamb into that of Leaning or Lying along. — Of David and his Mens eating the Shew Bread which was not lawful but for the Priests alone; and of our Saviour's telling the Jews that God will have Mercy and not Sacrifice.* 160

None of these Scripture Instances at all parallel to the Administration of Christian Baptism prov'd at large.

1st. *The Posture of Eating the Paschal Lamb.* 161.

2d. *The Shew-bread.* 165.

3d. *I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice.* 172.

The Conclusion, in a most Serious and Humble Address to the Most Reverend, the Right Reverend, and the Reverend, The Governours and Ministers of Christ over his Flock in all Parts of the Universal Church. 183

T H E

Preliminary Discourse

OF

The various Opinions of the
Fathers concerning Rebapti-
zation, and Invalid Baptisms;
with Remarks.

IN St. Cyprian's Days, about the middle
of the third Century, arose a great
Debate in the Church concerning the
Validity of Baptism administer'd by such
as were then either Hereticks or Schisma-
ticks; St. Cyprian with the rest of the Bi-
shops of the African Churches, together
with many of the Eastern Bishops, main-
tain'd, "That Catholick Bishops were oblig'd
to Condemn all such Baptisms, and to hold
them void and null, and by consequence
not straight to *Confirm*, but first to Baptize
all such, as having received no other than
those False Baptisms, in those False, and
Antichristian Communions, left them and
came over to the One, True, Catholick,
and only Salutary Communion.

B

" Stephen;

“ Stephen, Bishop of Rome, and his Par-
 “ ty, maintain’d, That by the Evangelical
 “ Law, Catholick Bishops were bound to
 “ Ratify Heretical and Schismatical Bap-
 “ tisms, and to hold them Good and Valid;
 “ and to admit such as having been Bap-
 “ tiz’d by Hereticks, or Schismatics, de-
 “ serted them, and came over to the True
 “ Catholick Communion, without giving
 “ them Catholick Baptism, or using any
 “ other Rite at their Reception, than that
 “ of Imposing the Hand for the Collation
 “ of the Holy Ghost.

“ THE *Stephanians* muster’d up a great
 “ many Arguments for the Validity of such
 “ Baptisms; They pleaded that Hereticks
 “ themselves were not so nice, as to Bap-
 “ tize those who came over from other He-
 “ resies to their Communion: That all Ca-
 “ techumens who died Unbaptized, were
 “ not therefore Damned; much less those
 “ who had received Baptism, tho’ from
 “ Hereticks, or Schismatics: That to Re-
 “ fuse those who were willing to forsake
 “ Heresy or Schism, unless they would con-
 “ sent to be Re-baptized, was to obstruct
 “ their coming over: That those who had
 “ been Baptized by *Philip* in *Samarita*, were
 “ not Re-baptized by the Apostles when
 “ they came among them (*Acts* 8.) and that
 “ they received Imposition of Hands only
 “ for the Collation of the Holy Ghost.

“ The

That tho' some in St. Paul's time Preached
 Christ out of Envy and Strife, i. e. from a
 Contentious and Schismatical Humour,
 yet he was pleased that Christ was Preach-
 ed: (*Phil* 1. 15.) That some Schismatics,
 particularly the *Novatians*, observed the
 due Form, and propos'd the due Interro-
 gatories in Baptism: That the Efficacy of
 the Sacraments did not depend on the Or-
 thodoxy, or the Charity of the Admini-
 strators; and that if Persons were Bap-
 tized in the Name of Christ, any manner
 of way, it was no matter who Baptized
 them: but the main Argument (as St.
Austin afterwards reckon'd it) was that
Stephen, Bishop of *Rome*, had had it hand-
 ed down to him by constant Tradition
 from St. Peter and St. Paul, Founders of
 the Church of *Rome*, that those who came
 over from Heretical or Schismatical Com-
 munion, to the Communion of the True
 Catholick Church should not be Re-bap-
 tized, and that all his Predecessors, Bi-
 shops of *Rome*, since the Days of those
 Apostles, had always conform'd their
 Practice to such unquestionable Tradition;
 They had always Ratified, never Repudi-
 ated Heretical or Schismatical Baptisms.
 THE Arguments of the *Cyprianists*,
 against the Validity of such Baptisms were
 briefly these. St. *Cyprian* rejects the Bap-
 tisms of *Novatianus* upon this very Score
 that

“ that he was not a Bishop; *Cornelius* was
 “ the only true Bishop of *Rome*; no Valid
 “ Baptisms could be perform’d in that
 “ Church but by him, or in dependance on
 “ him: *Novatianus* disown’d all Depen-
 “ dence on him, separated from him, and
 “ pretended to be Bishop of *Rome* in oppo-
 “ sition to him; his Baptisms therefore
 “ could not be Valid; they could not be
 “ true Christian Sacraments, *St. Cyprian’s*
 “ 69. Epist. And in the same Epistle these
 “ three [To set up an Episcopal Chair] [To
 “ assume a Primacy] [and to pretend to a
 “ Sovereign or Independent Power of Bap-
 “ tizing and Offering, i. e. Consecrating
 “ the Holy Eucharist] he plainly makes
 “ Equivalent Phrases, and by them expres-
 “ ses the one Crime of *Novatianus* in stand-
 “ ing up as an Anti-Bishop to *Cornelius*:
 “ That all his Ministrations were of the same
 “ Kidney with those of *Corah*, *Dathan* and
 “ *Abiram*, which were wicked, damnable
 “ and naught, because perform’d in oppo-
 “ sition to the High Priest *Aaron*. That it
 “ was unaccountable in **Bishops** to Ratify
 “ Heretical or Schismatical Baptisms; It
 “ was a Prostitution of the Honour both
 “ of the Catholick Church and the **Epis-
 “ copal College**: It tended to hinder Peo-
 “ ple from coming over from Heresy or
 “ Schism: It encourag’d them to think
 “ themselves safe and secure enough in
 “ either

“ either ; for if there they had true Bap-
“ tism ; why not likewise a true Church
“ and true Remission of Sins ? To weak-
“ en the Authority of a pretended Custom
“ to the contrary, he lays it down for an
“ undoubted Truth, That we are not to
“ be determin’d by any **Customs** of that
“ Nature, but to examine whether they
“ will bear the Test of Reason. He assem-
“ bled at *Carthage*, a Council of 71 Bishops,
“ who confirmed all that had been deter-
“ min’d a little before in another Synod
“ held in the same City, concerning the
“ Baptism of Hereticks, viz. that it was
“ null and void ; and about the same time,
“ immediately after this Council he writ
“ a long Letter to *Jubaianus*, a Bishop who
“ had consulted him about this Question,
“ wherein he urges abundance of Reasons
“ and Texts of Scripture to support his
“ own Opinion, and answer’d the Objecti-
“ ons that were brought against it. In ano-
“ ther Letter to *Pompey* Bishop of *Sabra*,
“ he opposes the **Truth** of the Gospel, and
“ the **first Traditions** of the Apostles both
“ to the Custom and Tradition which *Ste-*
“ *phen* had alledg’d for himself. *Firmilian*
“ Bishop of *Cesaria* in *Cappadocia*, in his
“ Letter to *St. Cyprian*, openly condemns the
“ Procedure of *Stephen*, Bishop of *Rome*,
“ [who had answer’d *St. Cyprian* very rough-
“ ly] extols *St. Cyprian’s* Conduct, declares

" himself entirely in favour of his Opinion;
 " proves it by several Reasons; and assures
 " him it was the Ancient Custom of the A-
 " satick Churches; and that it had been re-
 " gulated many Years before in two Nume-
 " rous Synods held at *Synnada* and *Iconium*.
 " The same *Firmilian* Answers *Stephen's* Plea
 " of the constant Tradition he had handed
 " down to him from *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*,
 " as before mention'd; That his, viz. *Ste-*
 " *phen's* Allegation was utterly false; he
 " could have no such Tradition from those
 " Apostles; (i. e. *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*,)
 " from whom he pretended to have it, and
 " that for this very good Reason, that in
 " their Days there were no Heretical Com-
 " munion; by consequence no Heretical
 " Baptisms; no Baptisms out of the true
 " Communion of the Church Catholick,
 " and that therefore he slander'd them by
 " fathering such a Tradition on them, seeing
 " it was certain that they taught the quite
 " contrary in their Epistles: that *St. Paul*
 " (*Act. 19.*) Re-baptized those who had
 " been Baptized by *John the Baptist*, ought
 " not we then (says he) to Baptize those
 " who come from Heresy to the Church?
 " Will any Man say that the Bishops now
 " a days are greater than *St. Paul* was?
 " which they must needs be, if they are able
 " to do that which he could not, if they
 " by Imposition of Hands only, can give
 " the

“ the Holy Ghost to Hereticks when they
 “ come to them. St. Cyprian in his Letter
 “ to *Jubaianus* Reasons to this purpose a-
 “ gainst the Validity of such Baptisms;
 “ 'Tis evident where and by whom the
 “ **Remission of Sins** (which is given in
 “ baptism) can be given; for our Lord
 “ gave first to *Peter*, &c. that Power, that
 “ Whatsoever he should loose in Earth
 “ should be loosed in Heaven; then after
 “ his Resurrection he gave it to all the Apo-
 “ stles, when he said (*John 20. 21, 22, 23*)
 “ *As my Father hath sent me, &c.* Whence
 “ we learn that none have Authority to
 “ **Baptize** and **Remit Sins** but the **Bi-**
 “ **shops**, and those who are founded in the
 “ Evangelical Law, and our Lords Institu-
 “ tion, and that nothing can be bound or
 “ loosed *out of the Church*, seeing there is
 “ none *there* who has the Power of blinding
 “ and loosing. Jesus Christ (says *Fortuna-*
 “ *tus*; In the venerable Council of *Car-*
 “ *thage*, Anno 256) Our Lord and God,
 “ the Son of God the Father and Creator,
 “ built his Church upon a Rock, and not
 “ upon Heresy; and he gave the Power of
 “ Baptizing to **Bishops** and not to Hereticks.
 “ Those therefore who are *out of the Church*
 “ and stand against Christ, and scatter his
 “ Flock, cannot Baptize, being *out of the*
 “ *Church*.

I T would be endless to mention all the
 B 4 Testimonies

Testimonies and Arguments, brought in that
 Age against the Validity of such Baptisms.
 I shall therefore name but one more, which
 seems to be of great moment for the Disco-
 very of what was meant by Hereticks and
 Schismatics in those Days; and that is
Firmilian who in one of his Letters says,
 " That he and all the Bishops who met with
 " him in the Synod of *Iconium*, Decreed
 " that all those should be holden as Unbap-
 " tized, who were Baptized by such as had
 " once been Bishops in the Catholick Church,
 " if they were Baptized by them after they
 " had **Separated** from the Church: By
 which, and the other Monuments of that
 Age, it is evident, they held, that even Bi-
 shops, and all other Lawful Ministers lost
 their **very Authority** to do any thing more
 in the Ministerial Functions, when they ei-
 ther Schismatically or Heretically separated
 themselves from the Church of Christ:
 Hence doubtless it came to pass that *St. Cy-
 prian* and his Colleagues esteem'd all their
 Ordinations null and void, and consequent-
 ly that the supposed Sacraments administer'd
 by them, and those whom they Ordain'd,
 were no true Christian Sacraments, and
 therefore Invalid and Ineffectual: This, I
 say, appears to me to be the true Founda-
 tion of that great Dispute concerning the
 Validity of Heretical and Schismatical Bap-
 tisms, and which " *St. Cyprian* manag'd
 " with

in that
 tisms
 which
 Disco-
 ks and
 that is
 s says,
 et with
 ecreed
 Unbap-
 as had
 church,
 er they
 h : By
 of that
 en Bi-
 ers lost
 r more
 ey ei-
 arated
 Christ ;
 St. Cy-
 l their
 quent-
 ister'd
 dain'd,
 , and
 This, I
 ounda-
 ng the
 l Bap-
 anag'd
 with

“ with so much Christian Humility and Cha-
 “ rity, that tho *Stephen*, Bishop of *Rome*,
 “ was so far from agreeing to the Reasons
 “ of the Africans, (whether because he
 “ imagin'd they had a design to condemn
 “ the Roman Church, or because he thought
 “ this Question was of too great Conse-
 “ quence) that he was enraged against St.
 “ *Cyprian* and his Colleagues, and us'd their
 “ Deputies ill : Nay he prohibited all Chri-
 “ stians belonging to his Church to receive
 “ or lodge them, depriving them, not only
 “ of Ecclesiastical Communion, but also
 “ refusing them the common Civilities of
 “ Hospitality; yet he [*i. e.* St. *Cyprian*]
 “ could not think of breaking Peace with
 “ them; of giving up Communion with
 “ them; of Abstaining or Excommunicat-
 “ ing them; Notwithstanding *Stephen* had
 “ taken upon him to Excommunicate those
 “ who oppos'd the Ratification of Heretical
 “ and Schismatical Baptisms. Upon the
 “ whole, the Persecution of the Church
 “ by *Valerian*, Anno 257. put an end to
 “ this Controversy, St. *Cyprian* never al-
 “ ter'd his Opinion; the Greek Churches
 “ were for a long time after him divided up-
 “ on this Question; the Council of *Arles*
 “ first decided it in the West; St. *Austin* fol-
 “ low'd its Decision; the Western Church
 “ has embrac'd this Opinion, viz. That
 “ Baptism by Hereticks, in the Name of the
 “ Trinity,

“ Trinity, is Valid ; and tho’ the Eastern
 “ Churches have not agreed with her abso-
 “ lutely in this Point, yet they always made
 “ a Distinction between Hereticks, and dif-
 “ ferently receiv’d them.

“ IN the 4th Century, St. *Athanasius* re-
 “ jects the Baptism of Hereticks. *Pacianus* says
 “ That Baptism Purifies from Sins, and Uncti-
 “ on brings down the Holy Spirit, and both the
 “ One and the Other are applyed by the Hand
 “ and the Mouth of the Bishop. *Optatus*, that
 “ the *Donatists* (who by the way were Schis-
 “ maticks) “ committed a great Crime in
 “ reiterating Baptism, (*where ’tis to be noted*
 “ *that they Re-baptized the very Catholics who*
 “ *came over to them*) “ that ’tis not he who
 “ gives this Sacrament of Baptism that
 “ confers the Graces, but the Faith of him
 “ that receives it, and the Virtue of the
 “ Trinity. We ask (says he) if it be Law-
 “ ful to repeat Baptism given in the Name
 “ of the Trinity ? Ye maintain that it is
 “ Lawful ; We say that it is forbidden : The
 “ People are in suspence, *Let us therefore*
 “ *search after the Will of our Father, in the*
 “ *Gospel*, which will inform us that he who
 “ has been once Washed, needs not to be
 “ Washed again ; wherefore (adds he) We
 “ do not Re-baptize those who have been
 “ Baptized when they return again to us :
 “ He proves against the *Donatists*, that the
 “ Holiness of the Minister does not contri-
 “ bute

bute to the Validity of the Sacrament of
 Baptism, and that because the effect of
 the Sacrament is owing to God only,
 and in shorr, because the Sacraments are
 Holy, and do Sanctify by themselves:
 Yet he seems to think that we ought to
 Re-baptize those who were Baptized by
 Hereticks; but does not make the same
 determination concerning those who were
 Baptized by Schismaticks.
 St. Basil maintains that the Antients
 were perswaded that the Baptism of He-
 reticks was absolutely void: As for Schif-
 maticks he likes well enough, St. Cyprian
 and Firmilian's subjecting them to the
 same Law; because being separate from
 the Church, they had not the Holy
 Spirit, and so could not give it; but,
 says, he would not hinder the allowing
 of the Baptisms of Schismaticks, since
 the Bishops of Asia had thought it con-
 venient to admit them: But tho the Ex-
 cratites were Schismaticks, he declares
 that their Baptism ought not to be ap-
 prov'd, and that those ought to be Re-
 baptized to whom they had given Bap-
 tism; because they gave it with Presu-
 mption, on purpose to hinder the re-
 ceiving of it from the Church; never-
 theless if the contrary Custom were Esta-
 blished he confesses it ought to be fol-
 lowed.

THE

“ THE Council of *Eliberis*, *Anno* 305,
 “ Canon 38, declares, That a Christian
 “ who is neither Penitent, (*i. e.* not under
 “ Pennance,) nor a Bigamist, may Baptize
 “ in a Case of **Necessity** those who are
 “ on a Journey, being at a great distance
 “ from a Church, upon Condition that he
 “ present him to the Bishop, if he survive,
 “ to be **perfected** by Imposition of Hands.

“ THE Council of *Arles*, called by the
 “ Emperour, *Anno* 314, consisting of Thir-
 “ ty Three Western Bishops. Canon 8. de-
 “ termines the famous **Question** about the
 “ Re-baptization of Hereticks, and Ordains
 “ concerning the Africans, who had **always**
 “ Re-baptiz’d them, that if any one leave
 “ a Heresy and return to the Church, he
 “ shall be ask’d concerning the Creed, and
 “ if it be known that he was Baptiz’d in
 “ the Name of the Father, of the Son, and
 “ of the Holy Ghost, Imposition of Hands
 “ only shall be given him, that he may re-
 “ ceive the Holy Spirit; but if he does not
 “ acknowledge the Trinity, I suppose ’tis
 “ meant if while a Heretick he did not ac-
 “ knowledge the Trinity, or if the Heretick
 “ who Baptiz’d him did not acknowledge
 “ the Trinity, (the latter is the most likely)
 “ he shall be Re-baptiz’d.

BY the way, in this Canon ther is not
 one Word about **Lay Baptism**: And as
 for the Hereticks who then Baptiz’d, they
 had

had always, or at least most commonly, received Ordination from the Hands of some **Catholic Bishop** or other; nay, generally the **Heretical Bishops** were Consecrated before they fell into Heresy, by **Catholic Bishops**, or else afterwards by some Trick or other, got private Consecration from them, that so their Heresies might go down the better with the People: And the same we find concerning Schismaticks in those Days.

THE Council of *Neocæsarea*, Anno 314, Canon 1. says, "That if a Priest Marries after he has been Ordain'd, he ought to be degraded. How conformable this Canon is to the Gospel of Christ, let all serious Christians Observe and Consider; I mention it therefore, only to shew, that in those Days Councils were not Infallible in all their Decrees.

THE Council of *Nice*, Anno 325, consisting of about 300 Bishops, Canon 19. Ordains, "That the *Paulianists* shall be Re-baptiz'd who return to the Church. In this Council also a Canon was propos'd for obliging Bishops, Priests, and Deacons to observe **Celibacy**.

"IN the Council of *Carthage*, Anno 348, before they proceeded to make Canons, the President advis'd thus: we must have such regard to this time of Peace, that we neither weaken the Obligation
" of

of the Laws, nor yet Prejudice the present Unity by too much Severity. Then the first Head propos'd was about Re-baptization; he ask'd whether that Man ought to be Re-baptiz'd who at his Baptism made profession of believing the Trinity. The Bishops answered, God forbid; We declare that this Re-baptization is Unlawful, contrary to the Orthodox Faith, and the Ecclesiastical Discipline.

THE Council of *Laodicea* between Anno 360 and 370, Canon 8, lays, "That they must be wholly Baptized anew, who come from the Sect of the *Montanists*."

THE third Council of *Constantinople*, Anno 383, in the last Canon, concerning the manner of receiving Hereticks, who offer themselves to return into the Bosom of the Church, it is Ordain'd, "That the *Arians*, *Macedonians*, *Sabbatians*, *Novatians*, *Quarto decimani*, *Terratites* and *Apollinarists*, shall be receiv'd, after they have made profession of their Faith, and anathematiz'd their Errours, by the Unction of the Holy Spirit, and the Chrism wherewith they shall be Anointed on the Forehead, the Eyes, the Hands, the Mouth, the Ears, at the pronouncing of these Words, *This is the Seal of the Holy Spirit*: as to the *Eunomians*, the *Montanists*, the *Sabellians*, and all the other Hereticks,

“ ticks, the Council Ordains that they shall
“ be receiv’d like Pagans, &c. and at last
“ they shall be Baptiz’d.

“ THE Council of *Capua*, Anno 390,
“ declar’d that it was not Lawful to use
“ Rebaptization, Re-ordination, and the
“ **Translation of Bishops.**

THE second Council of *Carthage*, Anno
390, in the second Canon renews the Law
Established in the preceeding Council con-
cerning the *Celibacy* of Bishops, Priests and
Deacons. The 8th Canon declares, “ That
“ if a Priest Excommunicated by his own
“ Bishop undertake to offer up the Sacrifi-
“ ces in Private, and to set up **Altar** against
“ **Altar**, thereby making a **Schism**, he
“ ought to be anathematiz’d; because there
“ is but **One Church One faith**, and
“ **One Baptism.** My Remark on this
Canon is, That this **One Baptism** can-
not be suppos’d to be out of this **One**
Church, and therefore is only in it.

THE third Council of *Carthage*, Anno
398, Canon 100, says, “ That a Woman
“ ought not to take upon her to Baptize.”

“ THE Council of *Carthage*, Anno 401,
“ second Session, orders Bishops, Priests,
“ and Deacons to have no more to do with
“ their **wives**, *Directly contrary to the*
“ **Law of God.**

“ In the 5th Century flourish’d St. *An-*
“ *gustin*, Bishop of *Hipo* in *Africa*; he ar-
“ gued

"gued vigorously against the *Donatists* who
 "began their *Schism* by a separation of
 "some African Bishops, and proceeded so
 "far as to reckon all other Churches as un-
 "clean, and indeed to be no Churches at
 "all, and consequently when any Catho-
 "lick came over to their Party, they would
 "not admit him without Re-baptization,
 "making use of St *Cyprian* and his Col-
 "leagues Authority, who taught, "That
 "Baptism administer'd by Hereticks and
 "Schismaticks could not be Valid because
 "they were out of the Church, and the
 "*Donatists* esteem'd the Catholics to be
 "no better than such.

"St. *Augustin* in Opposition to them,
 "undertakes to prove that tho' his Party
 "were not the Church, yet the *Donatists*
 "were not to Baptize them a second time;
 "he confesses that Baptism perform'd with-
 "out naming the *Trinity* is Null; but
 "affirms, That if it be administered in the
 "Name of the *Trinity* it is Valid, *where-*
 "ever he be that Administers it, and ought
 "not to be repeated; That neither the
 "Ministers *faith* as to Religion, nor his
 "Sanctity avail any thing to the Validity
 "of Baptism; That it is God and not the
 "Minister who gives the Holy Spirit and
 "worketh the Remission of Sins.

BUT here, before I proceed further, I
 must observe, that it does not hence fol-

low

low, that because the Faith or Sanctity of the Minister avails nothing to the Validity of Baptism, therefore his ~~Authority~~ **Authority** by which he acts avails nothing thereto; for ~~Authority~~ **Authority** may very well be, and often is, ~~distinct~~ **distinct** and ~~separate~~ **separate** from both those excellent Qualities. And again, every one will grant that it is God and not the Minister who gives the Holy Spirit, &c. What then, does it thence follow that any Person may Administer? Can it be reasonably expected that God should concur with the ~~usurpations~~ **usurpations** of those who Act herein without ~~his Commission~~ **his Commission**, nay and in ~~opposition~~ **opposition** thereto, [as is the Case with us.] Certainly no; it cannot: For however he may Dispense with the want of a Sacrament, yet he has nowhere promis'd to give ~~Efficacy~~ **Efficacy** to those Administrations which are in any respect Contrary to his own Institutions; and to me it seems a meer Fool-hardiness and Presumption to expect it.

But to proceed:

St. *Augustin* in the 7th Book of Baptism, Cap. 53. says thus, "It is asked whether that Baptism is to be approved which is Administer'd by an Unbaptized



" sized Person, who out of Curiosity
 " has learned the way of Baptizing among
 " Christians? it is asked further, whether
 " it be necessary for the Validity of Bap-
 " tism, that he who either Administers
 " or Receives it be Sincere? And if they
 " should be only in Jest, whether their
 " Baptism ought to be Administer'd again
 " in the Church? Whether Baptism Con-
 " ferr'd in Derision, as that would be
 " which should be Administer'd by a Co-
 " median, might be accounted Valid?
 " Whether Baptism Administer'd by an
 " Actor, may become Valid, when he that
 " receives it is well dispos'd?

HE Answers to these, and such like
 Questions, " That the securest way is to
 " return no Answer to Questions that ne-
 " ver were decided in any Council Gene-
 " ral or National; but he adds, should
 " any Man meeting with me at such Coun-
 " cil, ask my Advice about these Quest-
 " ons, and that it were my turn to declare
 " my Opinion, having not heard other
 " Mens Opinions, which I might prefer
 " before my own, &c. I should without
 " difficulty acknowledge, That they all
 " receive Baptism truly, in any Place
 " whatsoever, and by whomsoever Ad-
 " minister'd, if on their Part they receive

“ it with Faith and Sincerity. I am apt
“ also to believe that such as receive Bap-
“ tism in the Church, or in what is sup-
“ posed to be the Church, are truly Bap-
“ tiz’d, as to the Sacramental part of the
“ Action; whatsoever be their Intention :
“ But as for Baptism Administer’d and re-
“ ceived *out of the Church*, in Raillery,
“ Contempt; and to make Sport, I could
“ not approve the same without a Reve-
“ lation.

HE endeavours to overthrow the Rea-
sons and Testimonies of the *Cyprianists*
against the Validity of Heretical and Schis-
matical Baptisms by the Comparison of
conceal’d Hereticks and *evil Ministers*, with
known Hereticks and *Schismatics*, “ for
“ (says he) if the Baptism Administered
“ by the ~~former~~ is Valid and not to be
“ renewed, why should not the same thing
“ be said of the *latter*, since all the
“ Reasons that are alledg’d for the Nullity
“ of the Baptism of Hereticks, may also
“ belong to *evil Ministers*? It is said for
“ Example, *That to give the Holy Ghost*
“ *one must have it, that Hereticks have it*
“ *not; and consequently that they cannot*
“ *give it* : Why may we not Reason af-
“ ter the same manner, concerning Bap-
“ tism conferr’d by *Conceal’d Hereticks*

“ or by Wicked Priests? Have they the
 “ Holy Ghost to give? Thus St. *Augustin*.

I cannot but take notice here, that this Great Man does not appear (to me) to have made the Comparison according to the design of St. *Cyprian*, and his Colleagues; for by the manner of handling this Dispute in those Days, 'tis plain to me that the Hereticks and Schismatics were suppos'd to be **Excommunicate**, and consequently to have lost all Valid Power and Authority for the Administration of Christian Sacraments, being themselves *out of the Church*; whereas the *Conceal'd Heretick and Evil Minister* not having separated themselves from, nor been excluded out of the Church, cannot, during this their Secrecy, loose that **visible Authority** wherewith they were at first invested, and we have no **other** Authority to trust to, except we had the Gift of discerning Spirits; so that the Reasons against the Validity of Baptism Administer'd by **known** Excommunicated Hereticks, and Schismatics, will not equally hold good against the Validity of Baptism conferr'd by **unknown** Hereticks and Evil Priests, who still continue in *External Communion* with the **Church**; because
 the

the former have not, but the latter have that **visible Authority** and **Commission** which Christ gave them to Administer his Sacraments ; as is plain from the Example of *Judas Iscariot*, whom our Saviour vested with the Divine Commission, notwithstanding his great Wickedness.

Leo, Bishop of *Rome*, in his 18th Answer to several Questions put to him by *Rusticus*, Bishop of *Narbonne*, Anno 442, says, " That it is sufficient to lay hands upon, and call upon the Holy Spirit, over those that do remember that they have been Baptiz'd, but know not in what Sect.

Gennadius, a Priest of *Marseille*, affirms, " That there is **But One Baptism**, and that we must not Baptize them again who have been Baptized by Hereticks, with the Invocation of the Name of the Trinity ; but they who have not been Baptiz'd in the Name of the Trinity, ought to be Rebaptized, because such a Baptism is not True.

THE 2d Council of *Arles*, Canon 2. says, " That no Man may be made a Priest who is Married, unless they will renounce the use of Marriage, which they call by the Name of Conversion.

“ Canon 17. The *Bonofiaci*, who Baptize as well as the *Arians* in the Name of the Trinity; it is sufficient to admit them into the Church, by Chrism, and Imposition of Hands.

St. *Gregory* about the latter end of the 6th Century, speaking about the return of several sorts of Hereticks into the Church, says, “ That they are Baptized when they re-enter into the Church, the Baptism which they have received not being true, since it was not given in the Name of the Trinity. When it is uncertain whether a Person has been Baptized or Confirmed, we must Baptize or Confirm them rather than suffer them to perish in this Doubt.

Gregory II. a little after, *Anno 700*, in his Decretal Epistle, answering several Questions put to him by *Boniface*, Article 8. “ forbids to Re-baptize those who have been once Baptized in the Name of the Trinity, altho it were by a wicked Priest.

“ *Gregory III.* Orders that they shall be Baptized again in the Name of the Trinity, who have been Baptized by Heathens. And also that those shall be Re-baptized, who have been Baptized by a Priest that hath Sacrificed to

“ *Jupiter*

Jupiter, or eaten Meat offer'd to Idols. Thus far, I think may suffice to have Collected what has been said about Re-baptization. Because

IT is well known that the Church began to be miserably over-run with ~~Errors~~ and ~~Superstition~~ after the Year of Christ 300, and that many Decrees of Councils and Fathers were from that time founded, not upon the Revealed Will of God in his Written Word; but upon pretended *Traditions*, and a *Dispensing Power* assum'd by some of the *Governors* of the Church, witness those Decrees which require Celibacy in the Clergy, &c. as you may see in several of the above-cited Councils; for which Reason I might very well have spared my Labour of making many of these Collections; but because I have been told that it becomes me to rest satisfied in the *Determinations* of the Christian Church about this matter, I thought it not amiss to enquire into them thus far; to the intent, that I might see whether I could procure any *well-grounded* Satisfaction from their *Authority*; and indeed I must acknowledge, that if this had been a Thing *Indifferent* in its own Nature, and not ~~determined~~ by the word of God, but left to the Wisdom and Prudence

C 4

dence of the Church to Decree as she should think convenient and necessary, I ought to have acquiesc'd with such *Determinations*, but the Case stands otherwise with me, I esteem Baptism in all its *Essential Parts* to be a **fundamental** of Christianity, (as the Apostle himself has told us,) a *Positive Institution* made by God himself; and the Holy Scriptures are **clear enough** for the Determination of all the *Necessaries* thereof, as well as of all other *Fundamental Points* of our Religion, and therefore the *Decrees* of Fathers and Councils have no more weight with me in this matter, than what they receive from their Conformity to those *Divine Oracles*, which are the only Rule of our Faith and Practice in *Fundamentals*, as all *sound Protestants* have affirm'd.

BESIDES, the Councils of *Carthage*, *Iconium* and *Synnada*, together with the Customs of the *Asiatick* and *African Churches*, confirming *St. Cyprian's Doctrine*, have as much (if not more) Authority to sway my Judgment in this matter, as the Council of *Arles* and the after *Determinations* of other Councils and Fathers; for these latter can pretend to no more *Divine Authority* than the former.

I am very well satisfied, that ther is but **One true Christian Baptism** which ought not to be repeated upon those who have receiv'd it: I find my self under an impossibility to believe, that this **One Baptism** is any other, than what Christ himself Instituted just before his Ascension into Heaven; I reckon an Essential Part of this Institution (and I humbly hope in the sequel of this Discourse to prove it) to be the **Divine Authority** of the **Administator** as well as the Water, and the Form of Administration.

I cannot be satisfied, that the Person who is said to have Baptiz'd me ever had this Authority, nay I know to the contrary, and also that he was actually in *opposition* to it; and tho' his meaning were never so good, yet I cannot think God concurr'd with such an Usurpation, when it was done without *Any Necessity at all* in a *Christian Country*, where truly *Authoriz'd Ministers* might have been had with as much, if not greater ease and speed than he; for which Reasons I find no solid Foundation for believing that I have received this **One Baptism**, especially since I my self should with great Reason have refus'd that which he Administer'd, if I had been put to my own free Choice, as it's
certain

certain I could not then, being but an Infant, I doubt not but some will say, *That I need not concern my self so much about that which I had no hand in, and wherein I was wholly Passive; if there was any Fault in such my Baptism, 'twas none of mine, but theirs who had the Care of me: To whom I return this short Answer, That the Parent's or Godfather's and Godmother's Act and Deed is interpretatively the Child's, and he must make it really his own when he comes to Years, by taking it upon himself; so that if then he owns their Sinful Act (knowing it to be such) he makes himself partaker with them in the Sin.*

BUT to return to the Dispute in St. Cyprian's time, and the Decrees then and since made about it; I cannot Dissemble my Thoughts that the Arguments and Determinations against his Doctrine and Practice, have nothing of that Reason and Solidity which an Inquisitive Person might justly expect in them: And that on the contrary, St. Cyprian and his Colleagues defend their Assertion [*that the Baptisms of Hereticks and Schismatics are Invalid*] with so much Judgment and Cogency of Argument, (*founded upon the Topick of such Hereticks and Schismatics, being destitute* of

of Holy Orders while they were out of the Church of Christ) that I wonder how it could possibly have come to pass, that their Doctrine should be afterwards exploded; especially when I consider that what they taught and practic'd herein, was confirmed by **numerous Councils** in those *earlier Days*, wherein Truth was more prevalent than afterwards; and *Tertullian* long before affirm'd the same thing, "That Baptism is reserv'd to the Bishop; Hereticks are not able to give it, because they have it not, and therefore it is that we have a **Rule** to Re-baptize them. And to go still further backward to the Days wherein some of the Apostles might be still living; *St. Ignatius*, a Glorious Martyr, and Bishop of *Antioch*, Anno Dom. 71. in his Epistle to the *Smymeans*, says, "Let that **Sacrament** be judg'd effectual and firm, which is dispens'd by the Bishop, or him to whom the Bishop has committed it. It is not lawful without the Bishop either to Baptize or Celebrate the Offices: But what he approves of, according to the good pleasure of God, that is **right** and **good**, and so we do every thing **decently**. THIS is so exactly agreeable to *St. Cyprian's* Doctrine, that 'tis no wonder he

he adher'd to it all the Days of his Life; and it seems to me, that nothing could have given *Credit* and *Reputation* to the contrary Opinion, but the *monstrous* encrease of *Heresy* and *Schism* afterwards, which brought in abundance of Damnable Doctrines, and Practices [*two of which you may see in the preceeding Collections*] insomuch, that at last ther was but little of Solid and Substantial Religion to be found in the World.

AND now, after all that has been said, I declare that it is not my Design to meddle with the Cyprianick Dispute in this Discourse; my business is not to enquire whether those who were *once duly Authoriz'd*, and afterwards fall into *Heresy* or *Schism*, and thereby separate themselves, or are excluded from the Church, can administer Valid Sacraments and Ordinations during this their Separation: no, I shall not so much as touch upon this at all, because I don't think my Case affected by it; all that I need concern myself about, is, whether those who act in *opposition* to the acknowledg'd and *duly Authoriz'd* Ministers of Christ; and who themselves were *never* duly Authoriz'd, can Administer *truly Valid Baptism*, and whether the Receivers of *those Baptisms* can

can safely rest satisfied with them, especially when they know of this want of Power and Authority in the Administrator. This is my Case, and this is all that I concern my self about.

AND therefore I wrote the following *ESSAY* in a *Mathematical Method of Definition, Axiom, and Proposition*, for the Information of my own Judgment, in this great Affair: it was not at first design'd for publick view, but finding others have been, and it may be still do Labour under the same Circumstances with my self, I thought it might not be unacceptable to them; and if they shall reap any benefit thereby, or if some abler Pen will undertake to mend my Faults, by letting the World see something *more Correct and exact* for that purpose, (The only Motive of my Writing) I shall obtain my end, which God be praised is not mixt with any alloy of worldly Gain, or desire of Humane Applause for this Undertaking.

AS for *Caviling and Disputing* 'tis not my design to concern my self (and loose my Precious time) in such *endless impertinencies*: If any one will *candidly* shew me my *Errors*, I shall heartily thank him for so doing; but I declare before-hand, that no less than such *Demonstration* as the Nature

ture of the Thing will bear, can ever go down with me for Conviction; I am not to be put off with the Authority of any great Names, *Separate from Scripture and Reason*, for this has caus'd too much *Error* in the World already, and 'tis high time now to reform from it.

London, February, 28. 1708.

LM

Lay Baptism Invalid.

**THE
INTRODUCTION.**

**Of the Nature and Obligation
of Divine Positive Institutions of Religion.**

Definitions.

A *Divine Positive Institution* of Religion is, that which God himself requires and commands to be done, and which (*having no intrinsic or moral excellency in it self*) without his Command and Appointment we could never have been bound to the Observance of; nor ever have convey'd to us by the Observation thereof, any *Supernatural* Benefit or Advantage whatsoever.

II. THE

II. THE *Essential Parts* of a Divine Positive Institution, are those which we are oblig'd constantly to observe, as long as the *utmost duration*, of the Force and Obligation of the Institution it self.

III. I call an Act *Invalid* for the purposes of such an Institution, when we have *no just Reason* to expect, that God should so far concur with that Act, as to *convey* by means thereof, *those supernatural Advantages* he has annex'd to the Institution.

IV. BY the *Supernatural Advantages* Annex'd to an Institution, I mean all those *Spiritual Priviledges* and *Benefits* which by Nature we cannot have, and which God has promis'd to bestow, upon *Condition* of our *duly* Performing that Institution, which he has made to be the *Ordinary means* of Conveying those Benefits to us.

V. By the *Divine Authority* of the Administrator, I mean *that Commission* which God at first gave to Men, and which they have ever since handed down to others, by his Order and Appointment, to Administer in his Holy Ordinances.

AXIOMS

A X I O M S

O R,

Undeniable Maxims.

I. **THE** *Essential Parts* of any thing, are of the same Nature as the *whole*.

II. **GOD** himself may *dispense* with any of his own *Positive Institutions*, either in whole or in Part; and bestow the *Benefits* annex'd to them, when, to whom, and how he pleases.

III. **NO** *Ecclesiastical* or *Civil Authority* can *Dispense* with any *Divine Positive Institution*, either in whole, or in any *Essential Part*, so long as it is binding and obliging to us.

IV. **THE** *only way* to determine whether an *Act* is *Valid* or *Invalid*, for the purposes of a *Divine Positive Institution*, is, to know whether that *Act* be *Lawful* or *Unlawful*, *Agreeable*, or *Contrary* to the *Will of God*, which is to be found *where*, but either in the *Institution* it self, or in some other *Part* or *Parts* of his *Writ-*

ten Word, relating to the same Institution.
2 M O I X A

V. NO Power or Authority on Earth, can by any after Act (*not appointed by God for that purpose*) make that which before was Invalid, to become as Valid as Conforming to the Divine Institution It self would have made it.

VI. He that *knows* to do good, and *does* it not, to him it is Sin, and a *Commandment* in Sin, can bring no Supernatural Benefit or Advantage.

PROPOSITION I.

EVERY Essential Part of a Divine Positive Institution of Religion, is of Equal Obligation and Necessity to us.

DEMONSTRATION. This is evident,

FIRST, from the very Nature of such an Institution, which (by Definition 1.) has no *intrinsic* excellency, or moral Vir-

tue to oblige us to observe it, till the Divine Command lays that necessity upon us : so that now we are oblig'd *only* by Virtue of the *Authority Commanding* ; which being but *One*, (i. e. That of God) must necessarily reach to *every Essential Part* of the Institution, and thereby make them all of equal Authority and equally necessary and obliging to us ; because *they are every one* of the same Nature as the Institution it self, (by Axiom 1.) And

Secondly, this is further evident (from Definition 2.) since we are *constantly* bound to observe every such *Essential Part* as long as the Institution it self shall have any Force or Virtue. Therefore since every one of these Parts have but *one Authority*, without any *Inherent Virtue* separate there from ; and are also binding as long as the Institution shall last ; it must needs be certain, that they are *all of equal Obligation and Necessity* to us. But this is so very plain at the first Proposal to all Intelligent Persons, that it hardly deserves the Name of a Proposition to be Demonstrated, and therefore I shall not loose more time about it.

D

COROL.

COROLLARY.

HENCE it follows, that as no Human Authority can dispense with any Divine Positive Institution ; (*Axiom 3.*) so neither can they give any *Superiority* of excellency, or necessity to one Essential Part thereof more than to another, because, they are all equally necessary and obliging ; and have their whole *Force* and *Energy* merely from the Divine Command.

PROPOSITION II.

WHOSOEVER justly esteems an Act (*said to be done in pursuance of a Divine Positive Institution*) to be wholly Null and Invalid for want of one Essential Part of that Institution, ought also to acknowledge that such an Act is as much Null and Void when it wants *but any other One Essential Part* of the same Institution.

DEMON. For he can reasonably judge that Act to be Invalid, only because it is unlawful, or contrary to the Institution ; (*Axiom 4.*) So that, the want of that Essential Part being unlawful, he thence concludes the Invalidity of the Act : Now, forasmuch

forasmuch as all the Essential Parts of the Institution are of *equal* Authority and Necessity to us (*by the foregoing Proposition*) it must necessarily follow, that the *Omission* of any one of them will be *equally Unlawful* or Invalid; and consequently such a Deficient Act, as wants any one of those Essential Parts, being by him justly esteem'd Invalid, ought also for the *same Reason* to be esteemed as much Invalid when he knows it to want *but any other One Essential Part* of the same Institution, which was the thing to be prov'd.

COROLLARY.

HENCE it unavoidably follows, that ther can be *no such thing* as a *Partial Invalidity* through the *Omission* of any Essential Part of a Divine Positive Institution; for if the Act be *wholly Null* for want of one such Part, it must be also *entirely void* for the want of any other; by Reason of the *equal Authority and Necessity* of every Essential Part.

PROPOSITION. III.

HE who knows himself bound to Conform to a Divine Positive Institution *in all its Essential Parts*, and is convinc'd

C 3

that

that he has not so far conform'd; can have no just Grounds to expect the *Supernatural Benefits* annex'd to that Institution, till he has done his utmost for the obtaining of them, by endeavouring an *entire Conformity* to every Essential Part of the said Institution.

DEMON. This wants but little Proof; For thus entirely to obey the Institution is certainly good; and he who knows this and does it not, to him it is Sin (*Axiom 6.*) which if he continues in, no Supernatural Advantage can accrue to him thereby (*by the same Axiom*) much less those Benefits annex'd to the observance of the Institution; and consequently he ought to do his utmost for the obtaining of them by endeavouring, &c. as was to be Demonstrated.

ESSAY

To prove the

Invalidity of Lay Baptism.

Especially to those who know
that 'twas Administer'd to them,

By one in opposition to

The Divine Right

OF THE

Apostolical Succession.

CHRISTIAN Baptism, is, a Divine
Positive Institution of our most Ho-
ly Religion, whereby 'tis appoint-
ed, that the Apostles and their Successors
to the End of the World, should [by Virtue
of a Particular Commission which Christ gave
them for this purpose] either themselves in
Person, or by their Substitutes, enter

into Discipleship, or into the Church of Christ, All Nations, Baptizing them *In the Name* of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, &c. The *Supernatural Privileges* and Benefits Annex'd to this Institution, are, the Pardon of Sins, The Gift of the Holy Ghost, and Eternal Life after Death; or as the Church of England words it, "*Being by Nature born in Sin and the Children of Wrath, we are hereby made the Children of Grace; Members of Christ; Children of God, and Inheritors (or Heirs) of the Kingdom of Heaven* : which vast and unspeakable Advantages none can ordinarily have any Right or Title to, but those who are duly admitted to them by this *One True Christian Baptism*.

THAT it is a *Positive Institution* is certain from hence; that before the Divine Command enjoyn'd it we were never bound to observe it, either in whole or in part; washing us *then* with Water, had no intrinsic or moral Virtue to give us any *Spiritual Advantages*, nor would it have had any thing more of *efficacy* for that purpose if we had been Wash'd with Water, and at the same time used the Words *In the Name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost*; for these Words being

pro-

pronounc'd could *then* have had no more Virtue than others: neither would it have signified any thing to us whether we had been Wash'd either by our *selves alone*, or by some *other Person*; or whether that other Person were a Common Man, or one *set apart* by Consent of the People for that end. None of these Things could by any excellency in their own Nature have convey'd to us any *Spiritual Benefits* whatsoever, nor could we have been oblig'd in a Religious Sense to observe *any one* of them; because the Divine Command had not enjoyn'd them; this I suppose all will acknowledge, and consequently that our Obligation to receive *Christian Baptism*, and *from them* by whom it is order'd to be Administer'd, is *wholly* founded upon the *divine Command* on which *alone* depends the whole Force and Energy of a Divine Positive Institution of Religion (according to *definition 1.*) and that therefore the Administration of *Christian Baptism* in *all its Parts*, is no other than a *mere Positive Institution*, exactly agreeable to the said *Definition*. This being premis'd, I proceed now to Demonstrate what are the Essential Parts of this great Institution of Christianity, *on the Part of the Administration thereof.*

PRO-

PROPOSITION I.

THAT *on the Part of the Administration*. The Divine Authority of the Administrator; The matter [Water] and the Form of Administ'ring, [In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.] are every one of them Essential Parts of the Divine Positive Institution of Christian Baptism.

DEMON, That the *Water*, and the Form of Administration in the Name of the Trinity, are Essential Parts of this Institution, was never Disputed by any; but Hereticks, and even these (except such as the Quakers) never oppos'd against the *Water's* being so; but only against the Form of Administration in the Name of the Trinity. I shall not make it my business to endeavour their Conviction, who oppose the plain and express words of the Institution, and from whence All Sound and Orthodox Christians have unanimously agreed, to pronounce Baptism Null and Void, when Administer'd without expressing the Names of all the three Sacred Persons; because such Baptisms are directly against the Institution it self.

TAKING

TAKING it therefore for granted by all, who have any value for this Holy Ordinance, that the *Water* and the *Form* of Administration in the Name of the Trinity, are Essential Parts thereof; I shall spend no time about the Proof of it; but proceed to Demonstrate, that the *Divine Authority* of the *Administrator*, is also an Essential Part of the same Institution; or (which is the same thing) that the *Divine Authority* of the *Administrator*, is to be constantly observ'd by us, as long as the utmost Duration of the Force and Obligation of the Divine Positive Institution of *Christian Baptism*, And, that it is so, will be evident,

1. From the General Consideration of God's making the *Divine Authority* of the *Administrator*, to be an Essential Part of his own Positive Institutions under the *Mosaic Law*,

2. By the Example of our Saviour's not taking upon him to Minister in such Holy things, till he was particularly and externally Commission'd for that purpose.

3. From the Words of Institution of *Christian Baptism*.

4. From

4. From the Design and Benefits thereof.

5. From the constant Practice of those who *truly are*, and of others who pretend to be the *Lawful Ministers* of the Christian Church.

6. From the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of the Church of England in particular.

First, I say the General Consideration of God's making the Divine Authority of the Administrator, to be an Essential Part of his own Positive Institutions under the Mosaic Law, will go a great way towards proving the like under the Gospel Dispensation; because, the things that were then written, were not written for their sakes *only*, but also for our Example (as the Apostle has told us) and as he has most excellently argued, almost throughout his whole Epistle to the *Hebrews*, wherein he makes the Comparison between the *Mosaic-Law*, and the *Gospel*, and gives a vast preference to the *Latter* before the former. 'Tis therefore worthy our Consideration that in the Law, *none* could approach the Divine Presence in the *Administration* of his Positive Institutes, but those

those who were first *Authoriz'd* by him for that purpose; and therefore we find that when *Corah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, exceeded their own bounds no farther, than the Offering of Incense, ther was no less than a Miracle wrought, the very Earth was made to open its Mouth and swallow them, their Wives and their Children, and all that they had; and a Fire from the Lord consum'd two hundred and fifty Princes, Accomplices with 'em in the same Crime; to make them a standing *Example* to future Ages, that none might Usurp the Authority of Administring in his Positive Institutions without a *Commission* first receiv'd from him. Nay, so Jealous was God of *his Honour*, that he suddenly struck *Uzza* dead, only for putting forth his Hand to move the Ark (as he thought) from falling there when it was shook; *his Zeal* was no defence for him, God would not pardon him but punish him for it, because 'twas none of his *Business* to meddle in such Holy things. So *Saul* notwithstanding his Plea of necessity for want of a Priest, and the Danger of falling into the Hands of his Enemies before he had made *his Peace* with God, had his Kingdom rent from him for presuming *only* to offer a Sacrifice himself, it being none but the Priests Office so

so to do. More Examples of this kind might be brought, but these I think are sufficient to shew, that God set such a mighty value upon the *Commission* he gave to *some Orders of Men*, that he would not accept of even his own Appointment when they were *prophan'd* by *unqualified* **uncommissioned** Hands : and what is this, but to make the *Divine Commission* to be an *Essential* Part of such Positive Institutions ? insomuch, that if any should have *knowingly* concurr'd with those who *usurp'd* it, they would have made themselves **partakers** in the Sin, as well as the Punishment of the Usurpers ; as we saw was exemplify'd in the Case of *Corah* and his Company, for no less than fourteen thousand seven hundred of them were destroy'd by a Plague, besides the great Number of those who were before swallow'd alive into the Earth, and burnt with Fire from the Lord : and if so, may we not justly infer that God is still as Jealous of *This Honour* under the Gospel, the Ministers whereof being of so much greater Dignity, by how much the Gospel is more excellent than the Law of *Moses*. It is certain that even now in the *Christian Dispensation*, No Man can take this Honour to himself, but he that is called of God,

was Aaron, and ~~which~~ ^{his} ~~was~~ ^{great} Gift, and the inward Dictates of the Spirit, but by an **External Commission** first given by God himself to Moses, and then by Moses, at the Command of God to Aaron. But

Secondly, The Example of our Saviour's not taking upon him to Minister in Holy things between God and Man, till he was particularly and *externally Commission'd* by God for that purpose; is a further advance towards proving that the Divine Authority of the Administrator of Baptism, is an Essential Part of this Institution. For, notwithstanding he was full of the Holy Ghost, which was not given by Measure but entirely to him; notwithstanding his Manhood was inseparably united to the Second Person of the most glorious Trinity, whereby he was more than sufficiently, nay, infinitely *gifted* for such a purpose; and notwithstanding the great Necessities, and consequent Miseries of all Mankind, which were continually wanting his Undertaking to Administer for them in things pertaining to God; yet he kept himself in his *private Station* for about 30 Years together, and never would take upon himself so *High an Office*, till

till he receiv'd his Commission and Inauguration thereinto, from the Hands of a Prophet [~~John the Baptist~~] who Baptiz'd him, to fulfil this Part of Righteousness and Justice, viz, of not taking upon himself to be a Minister of the New Covenant, without a special Warrant from God by the Mediation of one, who was by him appointed to convey this Power and Authority to him: And then we find, that God himself by the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon him in a visible Glory, and by an audible Voice from Heaven, saying, *This is my Beloved Son in whom I am well pleas'd*, confirm'd his great Commission; and that from thence forward, (*and not before*) he proceeded in the Execution of it: From that time he preach'd and taught, gave his Apostles order to Baptize and Preach, wrought Miracles himself, and gave others Power to do so likewise, for the Confirmation of his Doctrine, &c. Now, what should be the Reason of our Saviour's thus long desisting from the performance of such beneficial Offices? Was he not sufficiently gifted? Yes certainly he was. Did not the Extreame Miseries of Man's Spiritual Bondage call loudly for relief? beyond all doubt they did. Why then did not even Compassion it self, the Blessed Jesus

Jesus, then personally among them, undertake their speedy Rescue? Was it because his Hour was not yet come? Doubtless it was not come; but why? because he had not yet receiv'd his **Commission** from his Father. So that, if our Lord's Example may be allow'd in this Case to be Conclusive, it is plain, that not all the *Gifts* imaginable, nor all the *pressing Necessities* that may be pleaded, can ever of themselves give sufficient Warrant to Minister *Authoritatively*, for Men, in things pertaining to God, when those things are of such a Nature, as that a *Commission* from him must be first obtain'd by the Person who undertakes to Administer: And that therefore such a Person ought to be *duly Commission'd* for such Administrations. Now that Christian Baptism is such an Institution as *necessarily* requires, and *constantly supposes* the Divine Authority of the Administrator, I shall endeavour to Demonstrate

Thirdly, From the Words of Institution; and in order thereto 'twill be very well worth while to observe, that our Saviour a little before his Ascension into Heaven, appointed the **Eleven Apostles** and **them only** (notwithstanding the vast

E

Numbers

Numbers of other Disciples which he had at the same time,) to go to a particular Mountain in *Galilee*, which he had told them of, (*St. Mat* 28. 16.) Where when they were assembl'd he came to them, and first asserted *his own Power and Authority* wherewith he was Invested, to Authorize and Commission them for the *Great Office* he was then going to confer on them, saying, *All Power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth*, ver. 18. Whereby he sufficiently assur'd them, that they might rest secure and satisfy'd, that *The Commission* he was going to give them was of full Force and Virtue, and sufficiently Valid to empower them to Act for the future according to the *Contents* therof; and indeed the great things he was about to Authorize them to do, were of so uncommon a Nature, and of such vast Consequence to Mankind, that they might very well have doubted even of the *sufficiency* of their Commission, if our Lord had not thus fix'd their Faith in *his Power and Authority* to give it them: when therefore he had thus prepar'd their Minds, he then proceeds to give them *This Commission* as the *Consequent* of that Power which was given him over all things; saying, *Go ye therefore and Teach* (or rather)

ther) **Disciple All Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; And lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the World.** These are the Words of Institution of Baptism, wherein 'tis clear at first sight, that the *Eleven Apostles* were the *peculiar Persons* to whom the *Authority* of Baptizing was committed [*Go ye*] and not only they, but also all those who should succeed them, to the end of the World; [*Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the World*] for our Saviour's Promise to be with them *so long*, cannot possibly be meant of their *particular Persons* which were not to live to the end of the World, and therefore it must signify the *Apostles* in another Sense, *viz.* those whom **they and their Successors** should Appoint throughout all Ages.

SO that by the Words of Institution above recited, it plainly appears, that as long as the World shall last *The Apostles and their Successors* are the Persons *Commission'd* to Disciple the Nations, *Baptizing* them; and hereby 'tis necessarily *imply'd*, that as often as this *One Baptism* is perform'd, so often 'tis done by One who

has *this Commission* given to him ; otherwise the Promise of being with such *Commission'd Persons* to the end of the World, would have been *in vain* and of no necessity : And if it were not *design'd* by the Institution, that *Baptizing* should be perform'd to the end of the World by a *Successor* of the Apostles or his *Substitute* ; it might for the *very same Reason* be said, that *teaching* was not *design'd* to be by such a *Successor* to the end of the World, and so the *whole Commission* would be but *Temporary*, and consequently the **Ministers** of Christ, and **Baptizing** and **Teaching** would be but *Temporary* ; and Christ's Promise of being with his Apostles in these their Ministrations to the end of the World would have been made without any design of fulfilling it, which is a *Blasphemous Contradiction* to the Infallible Veracity of our Blessed Lord ; and therefore *as long* as the World shall last, ther must be *Baptizing*, and as long as ther shall be *Baptizing*, ther must be *such a One* to perform it, as Christ has promis'd to be with, *viz. a Successor to the Apostles or his Substitute*, to the utmost bounds of that Duration.

THIS will further appear from the Nature of a *Commission*, which is *exclusive* of all others, but those to whom it

is given ; for 'tis well known that when a Prince gives a *Commission* to any of his Subjects for the executing of some great Office, it is with design to appropriate that Office to that particular Subject, that none may act in it but he, and those whom he shall Authorize : So here *The Commission* of Baptizing, &c. given by our Saviour to his *Apostles and their Successors* to the end of the World, is *exclusive* of all others, and consequently none can act therein but such as they shall Authorize for that purpose ; and therefore it necessarily follows that the *Administrator* of Baptism must have the *Divine Commission* or Authority, before he presume to Act in this so *Appropriate* an Office and Ministration.

BUT the Form of Administring Baptism (*in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*) being *Essential*, for *even the Validity* thereof, is an *Invincible Argument* for the *Divine Authority* of the *Administrator*, that it should be also an *Essential Part* of this Institution, because, as often as any one Administers Baptism *truly and really* in the Name of the Trinity, so often he *expressly* affirms, and that *truly too*, that he does it by Virtue of that Power and Authority which he receiv'd from the Trinity for so doing ;

This will be evident beyond Contradiction, when we impartially Enquire into the *just* Meaning and common Acceptation of the Expression [*In the Name of*] when us'd by one who Acts for another ; which we shall constantly find signifies, that he who comes, and does any thing in another's Name, do's it by his Power and Authority who sent him. " Thus Blessed " *be he that cometh in the Name of the Lord,* (Psal. 118. 26.) is the same, as Blessed be he whom the Lord hath Sent, or who comes with the *Authority and Commission* which the Lord hath given him. So " *When David's young Men came, they spake* " *to Nabal according to all those words, in* " *the Name of David* (1 Sam. 25. 9.) 'tis no more than if it had been said, they spake to Nabal according to all those Words, and made use of David's Name to let Nabal know that he Sent them. Thus again, " *Haggai the Prophet, &c. prophesied* " *unto the Jews, in the Name of the* " *God of Israel,* (Ezra 5. 1.) What is this but to say that Haggai prophesied what God had Sent, and Order'd him to Prophesy to 'em ? When our Saviour says, " *I am come in my Father's Name* (John 5. 43.) He plainly declares that he was Sent by his Father, or came by his particular

ular Appointment. And Lastly, (To Name no more Texts to this purpose) when our Blessed Lord affirms, "*They* *Works that I do in my Fathers Name* *they bear Witness of me* (*John 10. 25.*) he in plain Terms asserts, that he did those Works by Virtue of that Power and Authority which he had receiv'd from his Father. So when a Magistrate declares that he Acts *in the Name* of his Prince, every one immediately understands thereby that he Acts by the Authority which he receiv'd from him; but this is too plain to want more Examples; and therefore we may justly conclude that every time the Minister says, *I Baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; it is the same as to say, *I Baptize thee by Virtue of that Authority and Commission which I have receiv'd from the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*; and therefore when he Baptizes a Person, and pronounces the Words, *In the Name of the Father, &c.* if he be one who is *not* vested with the Divine Authority, he cannot be truly said to Baptize in the Name of the Trinity, for 'tis a perfect Contradiction to say such a thing is truly done in the Name of another, when really it is not done in his Name, or by his Au-

thority and Commission, which is the only intelligible way of doing something in another's Name.

THUS we see how our Lord has inseparably United the *Divine Authority* of the *Administrator*, with the truth and reality of the *Form of Administration*, in so much, That the Form it self is no further true, as to the design thereof, than as it is attended with the Truth and Reality of the *Divine Commission* given to him who Administers; so that whensoever this Form is truly us'd according to the Intent of this Institution, the *Divine Authority* and *Commission* of him who Administers, is necessarily and constantly implied and suppos'd.

AND really if we examine into all the *Divine Positive Institutions* that ever were made, we shall find none of them so indispensibly require the *Divine Authority* of the *Administrator*, and attended with such a *Solemn Form* of Asserting and Declaring his Authority every time of Administration, as we find in the *Divine Positive Institution* of Christian Baptism; and consequently the *Divine Authority* of the *Administrator* of Baptism is an *Essential Part* of that great Institution.

BUT

BUT here I expect some will tell me, that I lay too much stress upon the Form of Administring Baptism, *In the Name* of the Trinity; because in the *Greek* it is said, *Go ye, &c. Baptizing them Into the Name* (instead of *In the Name*) of the Father, &c. and tho' *In the Name* signifies by the Authority and Commission of the Trinity, yet *Into the Name* do's not signify So, but rather into the Belief and Service of the Trinity; which do's not imply so necessarily the Divine Authority of the Administrator as I plead for.

TO whom I Answer, that tho' the *Greek* do's signify *Into the Name*, yet it do's not therefore follow that this is the Only Sense of the Word in the Original Language, wherein St. *Matthew* wrote his Gospel, which the best Criticks affirm was *Hebrew*, or *Syri-Chaldaick*, the Language of the Jews in our Saviour's time, whereof the *Greek* is but a Translation. 'Tis certain that the Universal Church of Christ has in all Ages retained, and constantly practic'd the Form *In the Name* of the Trinity; and all Antient and Modern Translations from the *Greek* it self, have inserted in the Text of the Institution, *In the Name*, rather than *Into the Name*; which plainly intimates that the
Former

Former, is the most Genuin Sense of St. Matthew's Original Word, and consequently, sufficiently Authorizes me to lay so great a stress upon the usual Form of Administring Baptism *in the Name* of the Trinity, which necessarily supposes the Administrator therof to be Vested with the Divine Power and Commission, where in I am the more confirm'd by the 26th Article of the Church of England, which expressly affirms, that the Administrator do Minister by "*Christ's Commission and Authority*."

Dr. Hammond indeed in his Practical Catech. Lib. 6. S. 2. mentions the Greek [*in the Name*] but then he applies it only to the Part of the Person Baptized, and says that it signifies, "*That he devotes and dedicates himself up to be ruled as an obedient Servant, by the Directions of this great Master, a willing Disciple of this Blessed Trinity* : But this is nothing to our present purpose, which is only to enquire, what the Form of Administration signifies on the Ministers Part ; and this the same Author tells us in the forecited place, viz. "*That the Words [I Baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost] being prescrib'd by Christ to his Disciples (i. e. Apostles)*,"

“ Apostles) must indispensably be us’d by all
 “ in the Administration, and the meaning
 “ of them on the Ministers Part, is, that
 “ what he does, he do’s not of himself, but
 “ in the Name or Power of, or by Com-
 “ mission from the Blessed Trinity.

N A Y, tho’ the Minister in Baptizing should say, I Baptize thee *into the Name* of the Father, &c. (which would be contrary to the Universal Form) yet even then he would thereby assert the Divine Commission by which he Acted; because on his Part, Baptizing the Person *into the Name*, must signify that by that Action he admits him *into the Service* of the Blessed Trinity; which being a Service of Infinite Benefit, and attended with Inestimable *Supernatural* Rewards to the Person admitted; must necessarily suppose the Person admitting to be Vested with a particular Power and supernatural Authority for so great a Purpose; Because, *no Natural Power or Authority*, is sufficient to confer any the least *Supernatural* Benefit or Advantage. But this Truth will be further confirm’d by the Arguments that may be drawn,

Fourthly, From the *Design and Benefits* of Christian Baptism. For by the Words
 of

of Institution 'tis plain, that the Design thereof is to *Disciple* all Nations, (St. Mat. 28.) or which is the same thing, to *enter* them into the Church of Christ, which in several Places of Sacred Scripture is called the *Kingdom* of God, and the *Kingdom* of Heaven : Now 'tis evident to whom our Saviour gave the *Keys* of the Kingdom of Heaven, viz. to his Apostles expressly, and in *them* to their *Successors*, and consequently that he gave to them, and those only whom they should Authorize the Supernatural Power of admitting Persons into the Church by Baptism, which is the only Rite of Initiation into this Sacred Society.

ONE of the great Priviledges of True Christian Baptism, is, that it is for the *Forgiveness of Sins* ; this is a supernatural Benefit, and therefore it may be justly ask'd, Who can forgive Sins but *God only* ? and if none can, then certainly no Man can assume to himself the Power of *Conveying* this Forgiveness of Sins to others by the *Means* of Baptism, except he be endow'd for that purpose with Power from *on High*, even from *God* himself ; and if any should without the Divine Commission, suppose himself to have this Power, 'tis plain that his Ministrations must be ineffectual for

for so great a purpose, because he is destitute of the Divine Character; he do's not truly personate God the Bestower of this great Priviledge, but runs without being sent; and God has not any where either by Promise or Covenant oblig'd himself to Ratifie and Confirm the Precipitate Acts, and Usurp'd Administrations of such Rash and Presumptuous Undertakers; but we know to whom our Lord gave this Authority, viz. to his Apostles (and therefore will confirm their Acts) when he said, "*Whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and therefore they only, and such as they appoint, can Mediatly remit Sins by Christian Baptism.*"

ANOTHER great Priviledge of Christian Baptism is, that those who receive it are thereby intitl'd to all the unspeakable Advantages of Free Denizens of Heaven, notwithstanding that before they were Aliens and Strangers, and therefore had no Claim, nor any Right or Title to this Freedom. Now let any Man but seriously reflect how unreasonable 'twould be for a Stranger and Foreigner in any State or Kingdom, to imagine that every, even Natural Subject there, could have Authority to grant him a *Valid Naturalization,* and

and thereby endow him with all the *Rights* and *Immunities* which the Free Born Subjects of that State or Kingdom do enjoy ; would it not be Ridiculous for him to accept (knowingly) of such a pretended Naturalization ? and if he should ; can it be thought reasonable, that he should enjoy all the Advantages annex'd to a True and Lawful Naturalization, to be receiv'd from the Hands of those only who are Authoriz'd for that purpose ? certainly No ; never a well Regulated State or Kingdom in the World, that has Laws for Naturalizing Strangers, would allow it ; and shall it then be once thought, that every *Subject*, of how mean a Station soever he be in this Spiritual Kingdom of God, can have Authority to Intitle *Strangers* to all the *supernatural* Advantages which are consequent to a *Legal and Valid Naturalization* ?

AND indeed all the Benefits and Privileges of True Christian Baptism are so great and many, that it would be endless to recount them, let it suffice to say, that it is a Sign, a Seal, a means of Conveyance, and a Pledge to assure us of these Supernatural Advantages, viz. of being Incorporated into the *Honshold*, and thereby made *Members* of Christ, *Children* of God;

God, and *Heirs* of the Kingdom of Heaven, and of all the unspeakable Happinesses therof, which Eye hath not seen, nor Ear heard, neither have enter'd into the Heart of Man to Conceive.

NOW if any reasonable unprejudic'd Man will but duly reflect on these so inconceivable and inestimable Priviledges, so infinitely above all the Powers of Nature, either to Obtain or Bestow, without some supernatural Donation, 'twill be very difficult, nay, I may say, *impossible* for him to believe, that God, who is the God of Order, and not of *Confusion*, will bestow them by the *Mediation* of those to whom he has given no Authority for that Purpose: Especially when he remembers that God has set apart a *Peculiar Order* of Men to be the *Stewards* of these his *Mysteries*; and to whom he has giv'n the Power of the *Keys*, whereby to admit into, and exclude out of his Spiritual Kingdom, as the Sacred Scripture do's sufficiently inform us: These Men he has dignify'd with *extraordinary Marks* and signal Characters of *Honour*, and *separated* them from the rest of *Mankind*; that they might represent his Sacred Presence among us, and that we might have a *strong Confidence* and well-grounded Assurance of their *Divine Mission*; and

and of our own Happiness in being admitted through Baptism into the Number and Priviledges of his Children, by their *Authoriz'd Ministration*; for which Reasons, added to those others I have brought under this 4th Head, we may truly say, That the Divine Authority of him who Administers Baptism is an Essential part of that Holy Institution. But this is confirm'd also

Fifthly, By the constant Practice of those who *truly* are, and of others who *pretend* to be the Lawful Ministers of the Christian Church.

THE *Lawful Ministers* in all Ages have claim'd the Authority of Baptizing, even from the time of our Saviour's first giving the Commission to his Eleven Apostles, unto this Day; and for this *very Reason*, because they *Deriv'd* their Ministerial Power and Authority from Christ; but if the Divine Authority of the Administrator of Baptism were not an Essential Part of that Institution, their Claim would have been unjust when founded upon their *Divine Right*, and so every Man would have had as much Authority to Baptize as they: but forasmuch as they were never accus'd of Injustice for making

ing this Claim, (except by such Wretches as the Author of the Rights, &c. who would confound all Order in the Christian Church;) and since all Sober Christians, who *know* their Duty, never laid Claim to this Authority; it necessarily follows that the Lawful Minister's Claim is good, and consequently that the Divine Authority of him who Administers is an Essential Part of Baptism.

AS for those who *pretend* to be, but are not; the Lawful Ministers of Christ, 'tis well known, that they plead for the Authority of Baptizing upon this very score, that they *esteem* their Ministerial Commission to be of *Divine Right*; and therefore will never suffer their *Common People* to Administer Baptism; from whence it follows, that they also *in practice* confirm this Assertion of the Divine Authority of the Administrator of Baptism: otherwise their claiming the Power of Baptizing, by Virtue of the *suppos'd Divine Right* of their Mission, would be a meer foolery, and indeed a Contradiction.

SO that the Lawful Minister's claiming the Authority of Baptizing, because his Mission is *truly* of Divine Right; and the unlawful Minister's Claiming the same Authority because he *esteems* his Mission

also to be of Divine Right, do both conspire by their Practice to Confirm this Truth; that the Divine Authority of the Administrator of Baptism is an Essential Part of that Holy Institution; and this is not a little Corroborated,

Sixthly and Lastly, From the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of England.

For in her 23d Article of Religion, she affirms, That "*it is not Lawful for any Man to take upon him the Office of Ministering the Sacraments, &c. before he be Lawfully call'd and Sent to execute the same.*" Now what can this Article mean by [*it is not Lawful?*] Certainly nothing else but that *it is Sinful*, or Contrary to the Divine Law in the Holy Scripture, for she is not treating of Civil, but *Spiritual things*. But against what Law in the Sacred Scriptures is this a Sin? surely against *that Law* which treats of *these Sacraments*, and this Law is principally in the Institution of them; so that the plain meaning of this Article must be, that it is *contrary* to the very Institution of the *Sacraments* for *any Man* to take upon him "*the Office of Administring them, before he be Lawfully call'd and sent to execute the same.*"

AND

AND in her 26th Article, she teaches "that the Administrators of the Sacraments do not Minister in their own Name but in Christ's, and by his Commission and Authority.

AND least every One who has acquir'd (tho' not justly) the Reputation of being such a Lawful Minister, should fancy himself to have Christ's Commission; because the People made choice of him; and some others of higher Rank among them, took upon them to Ordain him, Separate from, and Independent of the Bishop;

In the Preface to her Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, she tells us thus; "It is evident unto all Men diligently reading Holy Scripture, and Antient Authors, that from the Apostles time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons; which Offices were evermore had in such Reverend Estimation, that no Man might presume to execute any of them, except he — by Publick Prayer, with Imposition of Hands, were approv'd, and admitted thereunto by Lawful Authority. [And what she means by this Lawful Authority]

is plain by the words immediately following] " And therefore, &c. No Man shall
 " be accounted, or taken to be, a Lawful
 " Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, in the Church
 " of England, or suffer'd to execute any
 " of the said Functions, except he be
 " call'd, &c. thereunto, according to the
 " Form hereafter following, **or hath had**
 " **formerly Episcopal Consecration, or**
 " **Ordination**; whereby she confines the
 Lawful Authority, so evidently to Epis-
 copacy; that a Man must be wilfully blind
 who dares to deny it.

• ALL which put together, sufficiently
 prove that by the Doctrine of this Church,
 the Divine Authority of the Administra-
 tor of Christian Sacraments, is an Essen-
 tial Part of their Institution; and conse-
 quently, that the Divine Authority of the
 Administrator of Baptism (which is one
 of those Sacraments) must be also an Es-
 sential Part of that Holy Institution.

• SO likewise by her Practice she con-
 firms this Truth; for in her Office of Or-
 dering of Priests, the Bishop says to the
 Priest: " Receive the Holy Ghost for
 " the Office and Work of a Priest in the
 " Church of God *now committed unto thee*
 " by the Imposition of our Hands. Whose
 " Sins thou dost Forgive, they are For-
 " given;

“ given; and whose Sins thou dost retain,
 “ they are retained, And be thou a
 “ faithful Dispenser of the Word of God,
 “ and of his *Holy Sacraments*, in the Name
 “ of the Father, and of the Son, and of
 “ the Holy Ghost, *Amen*. And delivering
 to the Priest kneeling, the Bible into his
 Hand, the Bishop adds, “ *Take thou Au-*
 “ *thority to Preach the Word of God, and*
 “ *to Minister the Holy Sacraments*. By all
 which 'tis plain, that she reckons the Ad-
 ministration of the Sacraments to be *Es-*
sential to the Office of the Priest, and
 that he must have *Commission* even from
 the Holy Trinity, by the Mediation of
 the Bishop, convey'd to him, to Qualifie
 and Authorize him to Administer the
 same. And in Conformity to this her
 Rule of Practice, when any Person, tho'
 formerly a *Teacher*, and one who has
 assum'd to himself before, the Power of
Baptizing and Administering the *Lord's*
Supper, notwithstanding his having con-
 tinu'd even in the *Tol. rated* Practice of
 these Usurpations for many Years toge-
 ther, nay, tho' chosen thereto by the Con-
 sent of the People who submitted to and
 acknowledg'd all such his Ministrations to
 be *Valid and Good*, when such a Man I say
 forsakes his *Heresies*, or *Schisms*, and re-

turns, or desires to be United to her Communion, and to be reckon'd in the number, and to have License to act as one, of her *Lawful Ministers*, she will not allow him such a *License*, he must be receiv'd only to *Lay Communion*, if he was never before *Divinely Authoriz'd* by *Imposition of Episcopal Hands*, and now refuses to accept such *Catholick Ordination*: She therby declares that he wants the *Divine Commission* to act in such Holy Ministrations, and that she will not acquiesce with his former Usurpations, he must *disclaim* and *renounce* them now, if in her Communion he would be allow'd to Officiate in the Word and Sacraments, as the rest of her Ministers do. But why all this, if his Power and Authority had been *sufficient* before, for the Purposes of the Holy Sacraments? if his Commission was good then, 'tis so now, and 'tis needless to *Reordain* him; but if it was *Invalid*, she acts consistent with her self in refusing to admit him among her Ministers, *to whom alone* she gives Authority for these great purposes. And really it ought not to be dissembl'd, that if such a Man's Administrations of the Sacraments were before *agreeable* to, and not *breaches* of their Institution, His Ministry before was also

also *Valid*, and therefore 'twould be even *unjust* to require him to take up a *new Commission*, and from *another sort* of Authority than what he had receiv'd it from at first; because, the Design of hard-
ing down Christ's Commission to Mini-
sters, in all Ages, is, that ther may be
constantly *such Persons* to Administer the
Holy Sacraments, as he in the first Insti-
tution of those Sacraments did Authorize
and Require: but forasmuch as the Church
of *England* requires such Persons, as above-
mention'd, to receive the *Divine Authority*,
which she reckons they wanted before, to
qualify them for the Administration of
Sacraments, 'tis plain that this her Practice
discourages us to hope, that without the
Divine Authority they are qualify'd for
such Ministrations; and consequently
confirms us in this, that the *Divine Com-
mission* of the Administrator is an *Essenti-
al Part* of the Institution of a Sacrament.
Nay, so very Cautious is she, not to allow
the *contrary*, that she makes not so much
as any exception for Cases of *Absolute
Necessity*, no not tho' an Unbaptiz'd Per-
son were giving up the Ghost, she has
not declar'd that any one may Baptize
him but the *Minister of the Parish*, or in
his Absence any other *Lawful Minister* that

can be procur'd ; as in her Office for *private Baptism*, which is the only Office she has provided for Cases of Necessity ; and what she means in the Rubrick thereof, by *Lawful Minister*, is easily determin'd by her 26th Article of Religion, viz. "*One who Ministers in Christ's Name, and by his Commission and Authority.*"

AND now to sum up all that has been said under these Six Heads.

FORASMUCH as God under the *Mosaic Dispensation*, which was but the *fore-runner* of the *Christian*, made the *Divine Authority* of the Administrator an Essential Part of his then Positive Institutions, insomuch as not to accept of the performance of the latter without the former ; Forasmuch as Christ himself, notwithstanding his own *Personal Excellencies* and *Perfections*, and the pressing *Necessities* of the whole World, which stood in need of his Ministrations, would not leave his *private Station* to take upon him so great an Office till duly Authoriz'd by the *Divine External Commission* : Forasmuch as in the Words of the Institution of Baptism, our Lord Commission'd *no other* than his Eleven Apostles and their Successors

fors and Substitutes to Baptize to the End of the World : Forasmuch as their Commission (as all others are) is *Exclusive* of all, but those to whom it was given; and the very Form of Administration of Baptism, *in the Name*, or by the *Authority* of the Trinity requires, and necessarily supposes and implies the *Divine Authority* of him who Administers : Forasmuch as the Benefits of Baptism are so great and **Supernatural**, that none can give or convey them by Baptism, but such as God has appointed : Forasmuch as all who call themselves the Divinely Authoriz'd Ministers of the Christian Church, have in all Ages claim'd the Power of Baptizing upon the Account of their *Divine Commission* : and lastly, Forasmuch as the Church of England by her *Doctrine* and *Practice*, gives sufficient ground to believe that none can Administer Sacraments but those who are *Divinely Authoriz'd* for that purpose, and that to pretend to do so, is contrary even to the very Institution of the Christian Sacraments : seeing all these premises are true, and not to be deny'd, without running into unavoidable Inconsistencies and Contradictions, it must necessarily be granted, that the *Divine Authority* of the Administrator of Baptism is

is an *Essential Part* of that Holy Institution, to be observ'd as *often* and as *long* as Baptism shall be necessary to be Administer'd, *even* to the End of the World.

PROPOSITION II.

THAT every *Essential Part* of Christian Baptism; (*viz* The *Divine Authority* of the Administrator, *The Water*, and *the Form of Administration* in the Name of the Trinity) is of equal Obligation and Necessity to us.

DEMON. This will follow from the first Proposition of the Introduction; which I shall apply to this Divine Positive Institution: for the very Nature of this Institution is such, that it had no *Intrinsic Excellency*, or Moral Virtue, either in the *Person Baptizing*, or in *the Water*, or in the *Form of Words* wherewith Baptism is given, to bind or oblige us to observe the same, till the Divine Command laid that Necessity upon us, as indeed we find it did; so that now we are oblig'd to observe this Institution purely and *only* by Virtue of this *Divine Command*, which forasmuch as it extends it self to *every one* of the said *Essential Parts* thereof (as has been

been prov'd in the preceeding Proposition, wherein 'twas Demonstrated, *That the Divine Authority of the Administrator of Baptism is an Essential Part therof as well as the Water and the Form* will make them all of equal Authority, and consequently of equal Necessity and Obligation to us; because, the *Divine Authority* of the Administrator, the *Water*, and the *Form* of Administration are every one of them distinctly of the same Nature (*i. e.* but meer Positive Institutes) as the whole Institution it self. And again, being all Essential Parts [*or such as are constantly to be observ'd as long as the Ordinance of Baptism shall be obliging*] 'tis evident that for the same Reason as one part may be omitted, another may be so likewise, and consequently that every one of them is upon all Accounts whatsoever, of equal Obligation and Necessary to us. *Q. E. D.*

COROLLARY.

HENCE it follows, that as no Humane Authority can Dispense with the whole Institution of Baptism, where 'tis binding and obliging (*Axiom 3.*) so neither can they Dispense with the Omission of either Water, or the Form of Administration,

nistration, in the Name of the Trinity, or the *Divine Mission* of him who Administers : Nor can any such Authority determine that one of these Essential Parts of the Administration of Baptism, is more excellent than another, because they have every one distinctly, the same Authority Commanding, from which *alone* they receive their whole Force and Efficacy, and are *only* by Virtue of *that one Authority*, made equally necessary and binding to us.

PROPOSITION III.

WHOSOEVER affirms Baptism to be *wholly Null and Invalid*, by reason of the *Omission* either of *Water*, or of the *Form* of Administring in the Name of the Trinity, ought also for the *same Reason* to acknowledge that Baptism is *as much Null and Invalid* when it wants *only* the *Divine Authority or Commission* of the Administrator.

DEMON. This will follow from the second Proposition of the Introduction.

FOR the *only Reason* why the *Omission* of

of either Water, or the Form, makes such a Baptism Void, must be, because such Omission is *Unlawful*, or *Contrary* to the Institution of Baptism (*Axiom 4.*) So that he must affirm such Baptism Null, because 'tis Administer'd either with such Matter, or Form, as the Institution has not appointed; or, because 'tis not Administer'd with such Matter or Form as the Institution requires; Now forasmuch as Christ, who appointed the Water and the Form, appointed also the Person who should Administer both the one and the other; and since the Divine Authority of this Administrator is an Essential Part, and as much obliging and necessary as Water and the Form, those two other Essential Parts of the Institution, (*by the 1st and 2^d Propositions;*) it must necessarily follow that the want of Divine Authority in him who Administers, is *equally* a Breach of, or *contrary* to, the said Institution; and therefore if the want of Water, or the Form, makes any Baptism to be *wholly Null and Void*, because contrary to the Institution; the want also of *only* the Divine Commission in the Administrator, must for the *same Reason* make that Baptism so Minister'd to be *wholly Invalid, and of no Effect*, being *equally* contrary to
the

the same Institution: and consequently
 whosoever affirms Baptism to be *wholly*
Null and Invalid, by reason of the *Omissi-*
on either of Water or the Form; ought
 also for the *same Reason* to acknowledge
 that Baptism is *as much Null and Invalid*
 when it wants *only* the Divine Authority
 or Commission of the Administrator,
 E. D.

COROLLARY.

FROM this Proposition it undoubt-
 edly follows, that the Invalidity of such
 Baptisms as are Administer'd by unautho-
 riz'd Persons, cannot be *partial*, but *en-*
tire; for if Baptism be wholly void for
 want of *Water*, or the *Form* of Admini-
 string in the Name of the Trinity, as the
 whole Church of Christ have constantly
 and with great Reason affirm'd; it must
 be also (by this last Proposition) as *entire-*
ly (and consequently *not partially*) Inva-
 lid, for want of *only* the Divine Mission
 of the Administrator; and all this by
 reason of the *equal Authority and Necessity*
 of every one of these Essential Parts.

I mention this, [that there cannot be
 any *partial Invalidity*, but it must be
whole and entire] because I have heard
 from

from some, that the want of the Divine Mission of the Administrator of Baptism, makes such a Baptism *but partially Invalid*; and that, provided the Person is Baptized by such a one, with Water, and pronouncing of [*In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,*] Imposition of the Bishop's Hand is sufficient to supply the other defect; and consequently to make such Baptism as Valid, as it would have been, if Administer'd by one *Divinely Authoriz'd*, that is, *wholly and entirely Valid*: but that this cannot be, is evident by the above-mention'd Corollary, wherein 'tis plainly Demonstrated that if in this Case ther be any Invalidity at all, it cannot be *partial* but *entire*: and as for the virtue of such Imposition of Hands, 'tis utterly contrary to *Axiom* the 5th, which is a *fixed principle*, viz. *That no Power or Authority on Earth can by any after Act (not appointed by God for that purpose) make that which before was Invalid, to become as Valid, as Conforming to the Divine Institution it self would have made it*: So that, if by *Imposition of Hands*, they would make such Imperfect or Invalid Baptisms, to be as Valid as the perfect ones perform'd according to the Institution;

can, it lies upon them to Demonstrate,
 that such Imposition of Hands was ap-
 pointed by God himself, either in some
 Law, or by the Practice of the Holy Apo-
 stles, for such a purpose; but this I Do
 despair of ever seeing them do; because the
Sacred Oracles give us not the least En-
 couragement, either in plain Words, or
 by good Inferences (to be drawn from
 such as are not so plain) to believe that
 this Rite of the Imposition of Hands
 with respect to Baptiz'd Persons, was ever
 Ordinain'd, but to be perform'd on those
 only, who were before *truly and Validly*
Baptiz'd. There is not one Example of
 the Apostles using this Ceremony to make
 up *such defects* of Baptism, nor any thing
 like it; and If in after Ages some use
 this Ordinance for that purpose (as I find
 they did) they seem thereby to have dis-
 pens'd with a Divine Positive Institution
 at the same time that it was *binding and*
obliging; which was taking to themselves
 an Authority that did not at all belong to
 them (by *Acts 3.*) I say they dispens'd
 with a Divine Positive Institution which
 'twas binding and obliging, because they
 allow'd of the *Omission* of the *Divine Au-*
thority of the Administrator of Baptism,
 which might have been had (and was
 therefore

therefore binding and obliging) at the same time as they gave Imposition of Hands to such imperfectly Baptized Persons, who might instead thereof, have been then Baptiz'd by themselves or their Substitutes; who were vested with the Divine Authority for that purpose.

AS for the Church of England she gives us not the least Intimation of any Efficacy in the Imposition of the Bishop's Hand, to give Validity to such Baptisms; as are suppos'd to be partly Invalid before; for, her Office of Confirmation is made only for Persons *Validly Baptized*; and if they are not so, the use of that Office upon their Account, will be a perfect Contradiction; because, the Prayer of the Bishop before he blesses by Imposition of his Hand, asserts, *"That God has*
"Regenerated the Person by Water and the
"Holy Ghost; and has given unto him
"forgiveness of all his Sins, which takes in the whole Benefit of Valid Baptism; and therefore cannot be said; with any Sense, over a Person whose Baptism is suppos'd to be but *partly Valid*, and consequently to convey but part of the Benefits of True Baptism: So little has she provided for any Method of giving Validity

to partly Invalid Baptisms, as some before her have done.

THE Cause why they would not in those Days give such Persons *Catholic Baptism*, at the Hands of those who were duly Authoriz'd by the *Divine Commission*, was, that they reckon'd *any Baptism* with Water, in the Name of the Trinity, by *whosoever* Administer'd, to be that *One Baptism* which ought not to be repeated; and yet, at the *same time* they esteem'd such a Baptism in some Measure *Invalid*, till it was perfected or rather mended by Imposition of the Bishops Hands; (See the Council of *Eliberis*, *Anno* 305. Can. 38. *Prelim. Disc.* pag. 12. now who (that seriously considers these things) does not see a great deal of inconsistency in this Matter? for if ther be *But one Baptism*, it must certainly be that which has *no Invalidity*, being Administer'd exactly according to the Institution; and therefore those *other Baptisms* which are not so Administer'd, and are therefore confessedly *imperfect* and partly *Invalid*, must be of *another kind* distinct from that *One True Baptism*, and this will introduce *two Sorts* of Baptisms in the Christian Church; which is utterly contrary to their own Assertion, as well as that of the Holy Scripture

Scripture, which acknowledges not more than *One Baptism for the Remission of Sins*, and consequently these imperfect Baptisms are no Baptisms at all, and so are entirely void, and of no effect. And indeed, to allow the Contrary, is in effect to destroy the whole Ministry of the Christian Church; and to open the Door of *Illicitness* to all Intruders into that Sacred Office, and thereby put every Man upon a Level, in so much that at last all may set up for themselves, and refuse to give any regard or attention; any deference or respect to our blessed Lord and Master, in the Person of his Authoriz'd Ambassadors and Ministers: for where will the Confusion end; if every Man may be suppos'd capable of giving *Valid Baptism*? Will they not argue; What need we attend upon others for these Ministrations; when we have as much *Valid Power* therein as themselves? If our Baptisms are Valid, so may our Administrations of the Lord's Supper, and much more our Preaching to, and Teaching such People, as we can gather to our selves: if Validity may be allow'd to all these, by whomsoever Administr'd, then Farewel all Rule and Order in the Church; and Christ's setting some therein, first *Apostles*; secondarily *Prophets*, &c. for

the perfecting of the Saints, for the Work of the Ministry, and his promising to be with them to the end of the World, was to no purpose. And it will not serve to say, that such Men will be guilty of Sin in those Usurpations, except we say also, that their *Authoritative Acts of Ministering* in what they call the Holy Sacraments are Sins too, and consequently, contrary to the Institution of the Real Sacraments, and therefore of no effect to convey the *Supernatural Graces* and Benefits annex'd to them: for, if ever Men can be once persuaded, that any unauthoriz'd Person can by means of the mere *Opus Operatum*, of what they call Sacraments, convey those unspeakable Advantages which are annex'd to Real Sacraments, it will be in vain for you true Ministers to tell them of their sin in Usurping the Sacred Office, when you in effect assure them, that every Christian can *Validly* Exercise it, and as fruitless will it be, to preach to them the Danger of *Schism* or causeless Separation from the Church, when you, by allowing the *Validity* of their *Uncommissioned* *Illegitimate* Ministrations of suppos'd Sacraments, give them an Argument to confound all that you shall say for their Condemnation, by your affirming that their Sacraments

craments are as true, and effectual as your own; and that, (since they thereby receive as much Spiritual Benefit as others do by yours, because God as much concurs with such their Sacraments as with yours) your charging them with Schism in adhering to Ministers who have no Divine Mission, is ridiculous and nonsensical, because, they have all as valid a Commission as your own, which you your selves must needs grant, by allowing the Validity of their suppos'd Sacraments. Nay further, if it be allow'd that such these Sacraments are Valid, then any Excommunicated Person (tho' never Authoriz'd by a Divine Commission) if he can but gather a Congregation to himself, may set up for a Valid Minister, and even they who know this, may receive Valid Sacraments at his Hands, if the want of a Divine Mission in the Administrator do's not Invalidate the Sacraments. Which is a Consequence so horrid, and attended with such infinite Confusions, that it should make sober Christians even tremble to think of it: And this brings me to my last Proposition, viz.

PROPOSITION IV.

THAT he who knows himself to have been *Invalidly* Baptiz'd, by one who never had the **Divine Commission**, can have *no just Grounds* to expect the *supernatural Graces* and Benefits annex'd to the *One True Christian Baptism*; till he has done *his utmost* for the obtaining of them, by endeavouring to procure *That One Baptism* from the Hands of a *Divinely Authoriz'd Minister*.

DEMON. For, however God may dispense with the want of this Sacrament, (*Axiom 2.*) to those who know nothing of it; such as Infants; or others who think they have receiv'd it tho' they have not, and would receive it if they could be perswaded that they had not; or lastly, those who know that they never receiv'd it, and are heartily desirous of it, but cannot possibly attain it; yet, as *he who knows to do good, and do's it not, to him it is Sin* (*Axiom 6.*) So he who **knows** that he ought to be Baptiz'd by a Minister vested with the **Divine Authority** for that purpose, and **neglects** to be so Baptiz'd, **incurs** the guilt of Sin, and consequently,
while

while he continues in that guilt, can (by *Axiom 6.*) expect none of the *Supernatural* Benefits annex'd to the due performance of his *neglected Duty* of receiving such *Valid Baptism*. This is so clear and evident that ther is no need to enlarge upon it : Only I would further add, that if he knows himself to be Invalidly Baptiz'd by one who never had the Divine Commission, and who notwithstanding presum'd to Baptize him *in Opposition to* and *Rebellion* against, those who were truly Authoriz'd for that purpose, his acquiescing with such a Baptism will be an Addition to his Sin, because he thereby makes himself a *partner* in the other's *Rebellion* and strengthens him and his Adherents in their Wickedness of *opposing* Christ's Lawful Ministers, concerning whom our Blessed Lord has positively affirm'd, that, *he who despises them, despises him, and he that despises him, despises him that sent him* ; and what greater Contempt can be offer'd to them, than to take part with such as *oppose* them in all the Ministrations of that Sacred Office to which our Saviour has appointed them ? This should make us exceeding careful not to *concur* with such Men in their *Usurpations*, especially considering that by this our

Concurrence we involve our selves in the guilt of *Rebellion*, even against God himself; the consequence of which must needs fall *infinitely* short of any the least Advantage, and on the contrary bring upon us the severest of his Wrath, instead of *those Supernatural Graces* and Benefits which he has promis'd to those who duly obey his Holy Institutes.

AS for those who do not, but yet *may know*, whether the Baptism they have receiv'd be according to Christ's Institution, or no, and consequently *Valid* or *not Valid*; it highly concerns them to make use of those Faculties wherewith God has Blessed them, ~~that~~ they may not be deceiv'd in *so great an Affair* as this is; for, *wilful Ignorance*, and *carelessness* in Spiritual things, will never excuse them at the Day of Judgment, nor will it then serve their turns to plead, that they follow'd the Instructions and Examples of their Teachers; for our Lord, who is Truth it self, has faithfully assur'd us, that *if the Blind lead the Blind, both shall fall into the Ditch*; and the *unprofitable* Servant who improv'd not his Lord's Talent, but hid it in a Napkin, was for his *Sloth* and *Idleness* branded with the dreadful Name of *Wicked*, and cast into outer Darkness,

to teach us *Diligence* in the most important things of another Life ; and what can be of greater Importance to us, than to know whether we are truly *Initiated* into the Christian Church, and thereby intitul'd to all *Those infinite Benefits and Priviledges*, those inestimable Graces and Blessings which every Member of the Church has a *Right and Title* to ? certainly, it highly concerns us to know the Truth of our *Claim* to such vast Benefits, since our Saviour has told us, That *except a Man be born of Water, &c.* he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God, he cannot be a Member of that Kingdom here in the *Church Militant*, the only known Ark of Salvation from the Wrath to come, nor in Heaven hereafter, in the *Church Triumphant*, if thro' his carelessness and negligence he has not been Really *initiated or enter'd* therinto by that *One Baptism*, which Christ has Instituted and Commission'd his Apostles and them only, with their Successors and their Substitutes, to Administer for that purpose, to the End of the World.

AND now having gone thro' all that I design'd to say about *Invalid Baptism*, I shall conclude with my Answers to some few Objections that may probably be started against this Essay.

OB-

OBJECTIONS.

Obj. I. **SOME** may Object, That, tho' Christ bid his *Eleven Apostles* Disciple the Nations, *Baptizing them*, &c yet, he did not therefore confine Baptism to their, and their Successors Ministration so, as that *none* can Administer *true Baptism* but they, and such *only* as they shall Authorize; for if he had, he would in expresse Words have told us, that no others should have Authority to Baptize but they.

Answer, 'Tis Universally granted that our Lord confin'd the *Matter* of Baptism to *Water*, and the *Form* to, *In the Name of the Trinity*; merely by his saying these Words, *Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*: So that no other *Matter* or *Form* can be introduc'd for the Administration of *Valid Baptism*, tho' Christ has not in *expresse Words* forbidden us to Introduce them. Even so, tho' he has no where said in expresse Words, *That none but his Apostles, and their Successors, and such as they should appoint might have this Authority*, yet I affirm, that he has confin'd true Christian Baptism to their *Ministration only*; because, he has done as much

as

as if he had said, so in explicit and positive Words: for he gave that Commission particularly to them, and to no others, and promis'd constantly to concur with, and support them in the Exercise thereof, to the End of the World; and he has made no such promise to Lay Baptizers; and this is as full and express, as his Appointing no other Matter than [Water,] and no other Term than [in the Name of the Trinity] as is very evident to all, who give themselves leave to think justly, and adequately on the Words of Institution. Besides, this Commission is of such great Moment, that the Apostles themselves could never have lawfully undertaken to Minister in it, if Christ himself had not particularly Authorized them so to do, because Baptism is, by virtue only of Christ's Institution made a Means of conveying **Supernatural Benefits**, which they had no natural Right to confer on any Man by means thereof, and they could acquire no **Supernatural Power** to do so, till Christ gave them that Power by a Particular Designation, as we find he did, in the very Words of Institution; and therefore, since the Apostles themselves could never have presum'd to act in this great Ministration, without a Particular Divine Commission;

it

it being impossible for even them to Administer Baptism Valid, for *Supernatural Ends and Purposes*, without it; it must needs follow, that no others can do so, but by *Virtue of this, or some other new Commission*, and if they have no new one, they must do it by *Virtue of the Old*, and consequently, he who Administers Baptism, Valid for *Supernatural purposes* (**and 'tis not Christian Baptism if it be not thus valid**), must necessarily be vested with the *Divine Commission*, given at first to the Eleven Apostles, and by their Successors convey'd down to him: And if so, then all others are excluded from any *Valid* Ministration hereof, because they are *Destitute* of this Divine Commission, which was never once given to them for such a purpose.

Obj. II. Others may probably Object, That at this Rate I confine the *Efficiency* of the Sacraments, and particularly of Baptism, wholly to the Divine Authority of the Administrator; and so, if the Person who Ministers, has not been *Commission'd* by Christ, he Administers no real Sacraments at all.

Ans. When the outward Elements of the Christian Sacraments are rightly Administer'd.

minister'd according to *all the Essential Parts of their Institution*; then, and then only, they become efficacious to the *Worthy Receiver* of them; and this their Efficacy proceeds only from *God's concurrence* with his Promise, made to such due Administration of them: So that in *Christian Baptism*, the Efficacy depends no more upon the *Divine Commission* of him who Administers, than upon the *Water*, and the *Form* of Administration; but upon *God's performing his Promise*, to bestow the *Supernatural Graces* thereof, by the *Mediation* of his own Minister's applying the *Water in the Name of the Trinity*: And therefore, as the Church has constantly affirm'd, that God do's not give Efficacy to *Water Administer'd even by his own Minister*, without the use of these Words [*In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*] because an *Essential Part* of the Institution is omitted; So, we have *no Reason* from *Divine Revelation* (which is our *only Guide* in this Case) to believe, that he will give Efficacy to *Water Administer'd* with the pronouncing of the said *Form* of Words, when 'tis done by *one who has not the Divine Commission* for so doing, because, *this* is also an Omission of *another equally Essential*

Essential Part of the same Institution; and
 humbly hope I have sufficiently provided
 AS to the latter part of this Objection,
 viz. That if the Person who Ministers has
 not been Commission'd by Christ, he Ad-
 ministers *no real Sacraments* at all; I re-
 dily acknowledge that my Discourse does
 imply so much; and that the contrary
 ought *upon no account whatsoever* to be
 affirm'd or believ'd; because, the outward
 Elements are not *Sacraments* by themselves,
 nor made any ways Efficacious for *Super-
 natural purposes*, till Administer'd as God
 has appointed in their Institution; and
 when they are so Administer'd, then they
 become *Sacraments*, and are thereby made
Means of conveying, and also Pledges to
 assure us of the *Supernatural Graces* which
 God has annex'd to such their Admini-
 stration. Now who does not see at first
 sight, that *none* can make any thing to be
 the *Means* of conveying *Supernatural Be-
 nefits and Advantages*, who have not the
Power and Authority of a *Supernatural
 Commission*? That no Person can make
 that, which before had no such Excellent
 Quality, to become a Pledge or *An Earnest*
 of Assurance, that God will grant us such
 Inestimable Graces, and Priviledges (as
 Nature could never have Intitul'd us to)
 except

except he be first sent, and thereby Authoriz'd for that purpose, by him who is to acknowledge the Pledge as his own, and for the sake thereof, is to perform all that was promis'd and imply'd by the giving and receiving of it?

As for Instance,

IN Christian Baptism, *Water*, the outward Element, is no Christian Sacrament till apply'd as the Institution of Baptism requires, and then, and then only 'tis a Means of conveying, and a Pledge to assure us of the Mystical Washing away of Sin; and how shall we rest satisfy'd and assur'd, that it is such a Means and Pledge, if it is not apply'd and given to us by **God himself** in the Person of his Representative, Commission'd by him to give us this Assurance? 'tis certain, that if *Water* be apply'd never so seriously, it cannot be the Christian Sacrament of Baptism, if it wants the true Form, [*In the Name of the Trinity,*] appointed in the Institution; this every one will acknowledge; and why then should any plead for its being a Sacrament, when the very Truth of the Form it self is destroy'd, by the Administration of an Un-Commission'd Person, who

who cannot really and truly, and without a Lye say, I Baptize thee in the Name [or by the Authority and Commission] of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; this his Usurpation is as contrary to the Institution, as a truly Commission'd Person's leaving out the *Form* wou'd be; as I think I have prov'd; and therefore, if the one hinders the *Water* from being a True Christian Sacrament, the other must do so too, because the Person to Administer is as much appointed, as the *Matter* and *Form*, of Administration: And this Person is as much the Representative of God the giver, as the *matter* is the Representation of the Graces given; insomuch, that we have at least as much reason to omit the *Symbolical Element*, as we have to leave out the Divine Authority or *Commission*, which represents no less than God himself; and therefore those Administrations of the *former*, which are destitute of the *latter*, are no Christian Sacraments or (which is the same) *Means and Pledges of Supernatural Graces*.

Obj. III. But if this be so (others will say) you have brought us to a fine pass; for 'tis well known that this Divine Authority is very much Controverted, and where

where to fix it, is not yet determin'd; so that while we are in this suspense, we must be always doubting concerning the Validity of our Baptism, and thereby you put this Divine Institution upon a very *precarious* and *uncertain* Foundation.

Ans. That the Divine Right of who shall Minister in things pertaining to God, has been, and still is, very much Disputed by some *Ignorant* and *Foolish* Men; and also by others of *corrupt Principles* and *wicked Designs*, we find to be too true, by woful Experience; but what then, do's that argue that it is *not to be determin'd* who has this Divine Right? certainly no; for tho' through *Heresy* and *Schism* the Minds of many Men are so dreadfully blinded that they do not discover this great Truth; yet, God be prais'd, those who continue in the Communion of the *Truly Catholick* and *Apostolick Church*, and are *Diligent* and *Inquisitive* to know God's Will, and to live according to that knowledge, need never be put to so great a plunge, as to be in doubt and suspense concerning this Dispute, or the Validity of their Baptism; which they have receiv'd from the Lawfully ordain'd Ministers of Christ; because such Ministers must be *visible* and *known* as long as ther is or shall

H

be

be any Truly Organiz'd Church of Christ in the World ; and that ther shall be *always* such a Church is plain by our Saviour's promise, That *the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it* ; and as for the true Ministers therof, that they shall also continue, is as certain, by his promising thus to his Apostles, *Lo I am with you alway, even unto the End of the World* ; and this is further confirm'd by the Apostle St. Paul's assuring us, that when Christ Ascended up on High, he gave *some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors, and Teachers, for the Perfecting of the Saints, &c.* — *'till we all come into the Unity of the Faith, &c.* — unto a **Perfect Man**. Now 'tis certain that this *Perfection* and entire *Unity* will not be compleated till the End of the World, and therefore these Officers appointed to bring about such excellent Purposes, must continue *so long* and be *visible* among us : And that this their continuance in the Church is to be *so plain and perspicuous*, as that it shall be easie to discover and distinguish them from *false Teachers* and *new Upstarts*, is evident by another Design, for which our Lord appointed them, *viz. That we henceforth should be no more Children toss'd to and*

and fro, and carried about with every Wind of Doctrine by the flight of Men, and cunning Craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive, (Eph. 4. 14.) For how can the Ministers of Christ defend us against every Wind of Doctrine, and the Cunning Craftiness of Deceivers, if they are not to be visible and known to us? So that as sure as God is true, so sure we are, that his duly Authoriz'd and rightly Commission'd Ministers, i. e. *Apostles* and *Prophets*, &c. shall continue, and be known by the truly Sincere, to the Consummation of all things; and therefore we shall never want such to Administer his Holy Sacraments, and consequently need never be in Suspense either about their *Divine Authority*, or the *Validity* of our Baptism Administer'd by their Hands; so that my affirming Baptism to be *Invalid* for want of such Divine Authority or Commission in the Administrator, do's not put this Divine Institution upon an uncertain, but a *sure* and *lasting* Foundation.

BUT here I expect that it will be ask'd in whom do I suppose this *Divine Authority* to be fix'd? I answer, that I do *not only suppose*, but firmly and undoubtingly *Believe*, after a strict and impartial

Enquiry which I have deliberately made into this Matter ; that 'twas settled by Christ himself at first, and *continually* convey'd down to this Day, in **Episcopacy only**, and of this I am *as certain* as that our first Day of the Week was appointed by Christ and his Apostles, to be the *Christian Sabbath*, nay, tho' I am very well satisfy'd that this our Christian Sabbath is of Divine Appointment ; yet I can safely affirm, that the Arguments by which it is to be prov'd, are not so *numerous* as those for the Divine Right of Episcopacy ; as may easily be demonstrated whensoever it shall be put to the Trial : as for those who are of another Opinion, I wish they had either more Knowledge, or more Humility ; it is none of my Business here, to endeavour their Conviction : but if they would use their utmost Diligence to do the Will of God in all other Instances of their Duty, and seek to him for that Wisdom which is from above, enquiring without Prejudice, by attentively reading the Sacred Oracles ; and comparing therewith, what has been said by many excellent Authors upon this Subject ; I hope they would then, *know of this Doctrine whether it be of God* ; which that they may

may I heartily recommend these few Modern Books to their serious perusal, viz.

A Modest Proof of the Order and Government settled by Christ and his Apostles in the Church. Printed for John Wyat, at the Rose in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1705.

A Discourse shewing who they are that are now qualify'd to Administer Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Printed for C. Browne, at the Sun at the West-End of St. Paul's, 1698.

Dr. Potter of Church Government. Printed for Tim. Child, at the White Hart in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1707.

Dr. Hickes's two Treatises, one of the Christian Priesthood, the other of the Dignity of the Episcopal Order. Printed for Richard Sare, at Grays-Inn-Gate in Holborn, 1707.

And a little Book call'd, *The Plain Man's Guide to the True Church.* Printed for R. Clavel, at the Peacock in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1708.

IV. But some it's likely will Charge me with uncharitableness, in denying the Va-

lidity of the Baptisms of Foreign Churches, where there is no Episcopal Ordination; and of many Good and Pious Men who are without such Ordination among our selves.

Ans. The Main drift of my Essay is against the Validity of that Baptism which Men know themselves to have receiv'd from Persons who were never Divinely Commission'd, and yet presume to usurp this Authority in *Opposition* to the Divine Right of Episcopacy: Which being duly consider'd, frees me from Answering to this Charge, with respect to such Foreign Churches, some of which have told you that they do not Act in *Opposition* to Episcopacy; and have pleaded that they lie under a Necessity not to have Bishops among them; but that they *highly* value and reverence that Order in our *English* Church. Whether this Plea of Necessity be good, or whether it affects them *so far* as to hinder their receiving Episcopal Ordination from other Protestant Churches, tho' they cannot have Bishops residing among themselves, is not my Business (here) to enquire; but this I'm sure of, that there is not the least Reason (nay, 'tis impious) to Complement away the Great Truths

Truths of God, to please any, tho' never so great a Party of Men.

THE Divine Right of Episcopacy is plain from Scripture, and was never call'd in question by any considerable Number of Men, till within these last two hundred Years; and must we now lay it aside for fear of opposing new upstart Notions and Opinions? God forbid! must our holding fast the sound Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles be call'd uncharitable and unkind, because it do's not suit with the Temper and Disposition of other People? Cannot we still keep our Charity for them by Believing that God may dispense with the very want of the Christian Sacraments, and bestow even the Supernatural Graces of them, to those who labour either *under an Irvincible Ignorance*, or else *an impossibility of receiving those Sacraments*, when they do all that lies in their Power to fulfil his Blessed Will? certainly we may, for God can dispense with his own Institutes, and give the Spiritual Graces annex'd to them, to whom he pleases (by *Axiom 2.*)

BUT as for some of those among our selves, I fear their Case is very dangerous, because abundance of them seem to want so fair an Excuse, living under that Epif-

copal Government which they refuse to acknowledge and submit to ; but God only knows their several Circumstances of Knowledge and Capacity, and the Strength of those Prejudices which some of them may have contracted by their Education ; He is Infinite Goodness it self, and will never punish any for what they *never could help*. But as for the Slothful and Negligent, the Obstinate and Perverse, we have no Authority from Divine Revelation to hope any thing for their Advantage. But to sum up my whole Answer to this Objection in the Words of an excellent Modern Author.

*“ THOSE who have been Baptiz’d by
 “ Persons not lawfully Ordain’d, and consequently they have receiv’d no Baptism,
 “ having receiv’d it from those who had
 “ no Commission to Administer it, but who
 “ were guilty of the Highest Sacrilege in
 “ Usurping such a Sacred Commission, not
 “ lawfully deriv’d to them by a Successive
 “ Ordination from the Apostles : [as is the
 Case with us] “ But yet thro’ a general
 “ Corruption of the Times, such Baptisms
 “ are suffer’d to pass, whereby the Persons
 “ so Baptiz’d swimming down the Stream,
 “ do think their Baptism to be Valid, and
 “ therefore seek not for a Re-baptization, [I
 had*

had rather say True Baptism], ^{from}
 " those who are empower'd to Administer
 " it. I say, where no such Rebaptization
 [or rather True Baptism] " is taught, and
 " thereby the People know nothing of it, in
 " such Case their Ignorance is in a manner
 " Invincible, and their Sincerity and De-
 " votion in receiving no Sacraments, yet
 " thinking them True Sacraments, may be
 " accepted by God, and the Inward Grace
 " conferr'd. But this Case do's not reach
 those who do, or may know and act bet-
 ter, and is the whole of my Charity in
 this matter, and I think a sufficient Answer
 to the Objection.

V. Another Objection in Defence of
 the Validity of Baptisms Administer'd by
 such as have not the Divine Commis-
 sion, is the Example of Zipporah, Moses's
 Wife, who Circumcis'd her Son, and ther-
 by saved her Husband's Life; for God
 sought to kill Moses, and when she had
 Circumcis'd her Son, he let him go; and
 therefore approv'd of her Act in so doing,
 tho' she had no right to do so by the In-
 stitution.

Ans. Whosoever will but look into the
 first Institution of Circumcision, will find,
 That God did not set apart a particular
 Order of Men for this purpose, but only
 requir'd,

requir'd, Gen. 17. 10. *Every Man Child among you shall be Circumcis'd*; &c. to the 15th Verse, *Every Male must be Circumcis'd*; but the Persons who should continually Administer this Circumcision, are not Nam'd in the Institution.

Nay, tho' it should be granted that Circumcision was to be perform'd by the Master, as he was the Priest of his Family, yet it do's not follow that *Zipporah* did any thing more than what she had a right to do, because her *Husband's Authority* was devolv'd upon her in his Sickness, when he was unable to do it himself; Especially, considering that this Sickness was inflicted upon him, because his Son had not been Circumcis'd, and that he might therefore Order his Wife to do it in his stead; and consequently 'twas Interpretatively done by himself, because by his Authority; as we find in the Issue by God's sparing his Life when the Circumcision was perform'd; and by *Zipporah's* Words to *Moses*, when she had cut off the Fore-Skin of her Son, and cast it at his Feet, saying, *A Bloody Husband thou art, because of the Circumcision*, Exod. 5. 25, 26. which plainly implies, that she did it for his Sake and by his Order. But what do's all this avail to those, who know-

knowingly receive, or acquiesce in Baptism receiv'd, from such as have no *Divine Commission*; when they may be Baptiz'd by Christ's own Ministers, whom he has particularly appointed *exclusive* of all others to Baptize? This is acting even contrary to the Example here Objected, because by all that can be seen in the Text, she acted by a *Divine Commission*, even by Virtue of an Immediate Revelation to Moses her Husband, whom God doubtless acquainted with the cause of his Displeasure, and the means of appeasing his Anger by *this* Circumcision of his Son; which was an *extraordinary* and *unusual* Case, and not at all parallel to the unauthoriz'd Ministrations of those who act *in opposition* to that *Divine Commission*, which has been Successively handed down, from Christ and his Apostles in all Ages.

VI. Another Objection is a Maxim, which some would persuade us will hold good in Christian Baptism, and that is, *Fieri non debet; factum valet. i. e. It is not Lawful to be done, yet being done, it is Valid.*

Ans. Tho' this Maxim may hold good in some Secular Cases, yet it do's not therefore follow that it will so in all. For Example,

Example, 'tis not Lawful for me to make a Man Free of the City of *London*, and though I should be never so serious and formal in pretending, or should really suppose my self to have sufficient Authority, to give such a Freedom, yet 'tis certain that such a Freedom given by me, would never be Valid, the Man must receive a Legal Freedom, notwithstanding the Counterfeit one he had of me : the like may be justly affirm'd of the Naturalization of Foreigners ; and many other great Concerns of this World ; and if this Maxim will not hold good in these, and abundance of other worldly things ; how much less in those of an infinitely higher Nature, in the Divine Positive Institutions, which God has made to be the Means and Pledges of *Supernatural Benefits*, to be conferr'd on us by the Ministration of *his own Particularly Commission'd and Authoriz'd Ambassadors* : Especially when we remember that this Maxim was never appointed by him, to be our Rule and Guide in any of our Affairs, much less in those of a Religious and Spiritual Nature, as without all doubt Christian Baptism is. Besides, the Objection acknowledges that it is *not Lawful*, therefore 'tis Sinful, and how a **Sinful**

Act

Act should be **valid** for **Supernatural purposes** is utterly inconceivable, nay, 'tis abominable to affirm it.

VII. Another Objection which I have heard of, is, That the Council of *Eliberis*, Anno 305, allow'd of *Lay Baptism* in a Case of necessity : that the Church of *Rome* do's so to this Day : and that the Church of *England* did so in the Reign of King *Edward* the Sixth ; of Queen *Elizabeth* ; and in the beginning of King *James* the first, as is plain by the several Common Prayer Books in those Days ; particularly King *Edward's*, Anno 1552, and King *James's*, 1621, still to be seen at *Sion College Library* in *London*.

Ans. I grant the Truth of these Matters of Fact, but cannot agree that those Allowances were Consonant to, but rather directly against, the Divine Institution of this Sacrament, for the several Reasons I have already mention'd in this Essay.

AS for the Council of *Eliberis*, I have cited it Page 12, of *The Preliminary Discourse*, where 'tis requir'd by the Canon, That such a Person as had receiv'd but *Lay Baptism* should, if he liv'd, be presented by the *Lay Man* who Baptiz'd him, to the Bishop, to be perfected by Imposition of Hands ; intimating thereby,

by, That such Baptism is not perfect without it. Now supposing (but not granting) that such Imposition of Hands could perfect such imperfect Baptisms, our Lay Baptizers break the Canon of this Council, because they Baptize *without any necessity at all*, and being in opposition to their Bishop, refuse to present such Persons to him for the perfecting of their Baptisms by Imposition of his Hands, so that this Canon will stand the Objector in no stead, till 'tis obeyed in *all its parts*; and then 'twill have no force against what I have said, till it can be prov'd that such Imposition of Hands is sufficient to give Validity to Invalid Baptisms, for all such imperfect Baptisms are no better, if the *Corollary* of the 3d Proposition be true.

AS for the Church of Rome, her Allowances in this Case are no Rule to us Protestants, who have separated from her for her many Gross Errours, both in Doctrine and Practice; she began to Quarrel with St. Cyprian, and other Primitive Bishops, and carried it very unchristianly against them, for not allowing any Validity in such Baptisms, and has ever since persisted in this ill Humour, so far as at last to condemn those who do not believe the Validity of Baptism Administer'd by Women,

Women, whose Authoritative Acts in the Church of God, are both contrary to the Law of Nature, and also forbidden by the Holy Ghost himself. "Saint Basil" in his 10th Epistle, complains of the "Western Bishops, and particularly the Roman, *Quod Veritatem neque Norunt, neque discere sustinent.* — Cum iis qui veritatem ipsius annunciant contendentes, hæresin autem per se ipsos stabilientes: That they neither know the Truth, nor care to learn it; but they contend with them who tell them the Truth, and by themselves establish Heresie; for which Reason their Authority ought not to be objected in this Matter by a Protestant; especially considering that such an Objector will not submit to their Decisions, even in things of a much more Inferior Nature.

I confess the Practice of the Church of England, in this Case, would have been a formidable Objection, if she her self had not answer'd it already by purging her Liturgy of so Inconsistent a Rubrick: I call it Inconsistent, because, especially in King James the first's Reign, she had declar'd in her Articles of Religion, that it is *unlawful*, i. e. *Sinful* for any Man to Administer Sacraments until he be *Lawfully*

fully call'd and Sent; and at the same time allow'd by her Rubrick to Private Baptism, that any one there present might Baptize the Infant (in a Case of Necessity;) and yet upon the Priest's Examination afterwards into the Lawfulness of the Child's Baptism, it was requir'd, that this Question should be put to the Persons who brought the Child to Church, viz. "Whether they think the Child be Lawfully and perfectly Baptiz'd, which (considering the preceeding Questions; "whether 'twas Baptiz'd with Water, and in the Name of the Trinity, &c.) seems to be needless and to no purpose, except by asking their Thoughts about the Lawfulness and Perfection of such a Baptism, they meant to make it Lawful or Unlawful, as the Persons they put such a Question to, should think it: Which is a very strange, and indeed a precarious and uncertain Foundation for us to build the Validity of our Baptism upon, in such a Case of Necessity. And therefore 'tis no wonder that the Church of England, upon a more exact Review of her Liturgy, expung'd this Question out of the Rubrick, and also for very weighty Reasons took away the Liberty of Lay Baptizing, in her present Liturgy, by requiring, even in Cases of Necessity

Necessity, that Baptism should be Administer'd by "The Minister of the Parish
" or any other Lawful Minister that can be
" procur'd; which is a Substantial Answer
to all Objections that may be rais'd from
her former Practice, when she was but in
the Infancy of her Reformation, and not
long Emerg'd out of the thick Darkness
of Popish Errour and Superstition. But
if such a Custom had been still continu'd,
St. Cyprian long since lay'd it down for an
Undoubted Truth, "That we are not to
" be determin'd by any Customs of that Na-
" ture, but to Examine whether they will
" bear the test of Reason. And Bishop Tay-
lor says, (speaking of Baptism by Mid-
wives) "This Custom came in at a wrong
" Door, it lean'd upon a false and Super-
" stitious Opinion; and they thought it bet-
" ter to Invade the Priest's Office, than to
" trust God with the Souls which he made
" with his own Hands, and Redeemed with
" his Son's Blood, but this Custom was not
" to be follow'd, if it had still continu'd;
" for even then they confess'd it was Sin,
" *Factum valet, fieri non debuit*; and Evil
" ought not to be done for a good end, &c.
" This Custom therefore is of the Nature of
" those which are to be laid aside. No
" Man Baptizes but he that is in Holy Or-
ders

" ders, said Simeon of Thessalonica; and
 " I think he said truly. But above all
 " things, Opinions are not to be taken up
 " by Custom, and reduc'd to practice: Not
 " only because Custom is no good warranty
 " for Opinions, &c. But besides this, when
 " an Opinion is offer'd only by the hand of
 " Custom, it is commonly a Sign of a Bad
 " Cause, and that ther is nothing else to be
 " said for it, Ductor Dubitantium, fourth
 " Edition, Page 638, 639.

AND in the same Book, Page 198,
 " In all Moral Actions, ther must be a Sub-
 " stantial Potestative Principle that must
 " have proportion'd Power to the Effect;
 " a thing cannot be done without a Cause,
 " and Principle in Morality, any more than
 " in Nature. If a Woman goes about to
 " Consecrate the Holy Sacrament, it is an
 " ineffectiue Hand, she Sins for attempt-
 " ing it; and cannot do it afterwards; and
 " it were wise and truer, if Men will
 " think the same thing of their giving Bap-
 " tism, unless they will confesse that to Bap-
 " tize Children is a mere Natural and Se-
 " cular Action, to which Natural Powers
 " are sufficient; or that Women have re-
 " ceiv'd Spiritual Powers to do it, and that
 " whether a Priest or a Woman do's it, it
 " no difference, but matter of Order only.

“ If an effect be Spiritual, the Agent must be so too; thus far that Great Bishop: And if his Reasons are good against Womens Baptizing, as I think they are, they will be as good to all Intents and Purposes against a Man’s presuming to do the like without the *Divine Commission*: because, he is equally destitute of a Spiritual Power, and *in fact* is as little in Holy Orders as she.

VIII. The last Objection that I shall mention is, what some great Men have made use of, to Establish the Validity of *Lay Baptism*; and that is, That tho’ it was a Sin for the Two Hundred and Fifty Princes to offer Incense; yet by even that Sinful offering the Censers, wherewith they offer’d were hallow’d, and God himself declared them to be so, *Numbers 16.* in like manner, tho’ it be a Sin for *Laymen* to Baptize; yet the Person so Baptiz’d is thereby Hallow’d and Sanctify’d; and consequently such a Baptism is Valid.

Ans. This Objection has no manner of Force for the purpose design’d; because ’tis not in the least parallel to Christian Baptism; for the Censers (mere senseless things) were Capable of no *Supernatural Spiritual Graces and Priviledges* to be enjoy’d by them, by virtue of that Offering;

but the Objects of Baptism, Sensible, Rational, and Immortal Souls, are to be possess'd of, and to be made happy by, such unspeakable Benefits and Advantages as are annex'd to Baptism. The Censers were wholly Passive; but the Baptiz'd Person is not so, for even in Infancy he is Active by his Sponsors, and when he comes to Years, must be so in his own Person. The Censers, tho' they were hallow'd, yet they were not hallow'd to the same purpose, as the Censers wherewith Aaron offer'd Incense; for God did not order those Two Hundred and Fifty Censers to be continu'd, for the same use to which those Sinners put them, but requir'd them to be made broad Plates for a Covering of the Altar: *To be a Memorial unto the Children of Israel, that no Stranger which is not of the Seed of Aaron come near to offer Incense before the Lord,* (Num. 16. 39, 40.) So that if these Censers are a Parallel Instance for Persons Baptiz'd by *uncommission'd* pretenders, then the use that God order'd them to be put to, should teach us to make the like use of such Sinfully Baptiz'd Persons, *viz.* To make them Memorials to all Christians that none who are *not Commission'd* by Christ, should dare to come near to Baptize in the Christian Church:

Church : But how shall such sinfully Baptiz'd Persons become such Memorials so effectually, as by renouncing their false, and receiving true Christian Baptism from Christ's Authoriz'd Ministers, and thereby frustrate as much as they can, the presumptuous *Usurpations* of those who have no Divine Mission for so great a Ministrati-
on ? This is the most proper inference that can be drawn from these Censers, with respect to such as are unlawfully Baptiz'd : Tho' after all, they have nothing in them that can with any Coherence, be justly adapted to the Institution of Christian Baptism, or any one Essential Part thereof : The Two Hundred and Fifty Princes, indeed, if compar'd to the Unauthoriz'd Administrators of Baptism may be something to the purpose ; and so may the Incense if compared to the Water in Baptism ; because, as this when rightly Administer'd, is the means of Spiritual Benefits, so Incense, when rightly offer'd *i. e.* by a Divinely Commission'd Person, was a means likewise of procuring the favour of God, by making an Atonement for the Sins of the People. But as for the Censers, they were *only* the Vessels wherein this Incense, the outward Means of the Atonement, was contain'd ; so that they

have not the least reference, either to the Person Administring, or the Water of Baptism, or to the Person Baptized; and therefore, if the Objector will have them to be Parallel to any thing at all in this matter, they must be so to the Vessel which contains the Baptism Water: And he may make as much use as he pleases of that Parallelism, which is nothing at all to our present purpose.

UPON the whole, the Grand Design of these Princes was (in opposition to the Establish'd Priesthood) to offer Incense before the Lord, *contrary to a Divine Positive Institution, which confin'd that Action to Aaron and his Sons only*; This Offering being thus unlawful, for want of the Divine Authority of the Persons Administring, was so far from being accepted, that it was a crying Abomination; and instead of procuring a Blessing, either for themselves or their Abettors, drew down upon them swift Destruction; the Princes being immediately consum'd by a Fire from the Lord, and Fourteen Thousand Seven Hundred of their Partizans destroy'd by a Plague. Even so, if any thing about Baptism may be hence infer'd, we may justly fear that the Administration of suppos'd Baptism by Uncommission'd

commission'd Persons, in Opposition to the Divinely establish'd Priesthood of the Christian Church, instead of being a Means of conveying Spiritual Graces and Benefits, to those who *knowingly* receive, or acquiesce in it, will rather exclude both such Giver and Receiver, (tho' they escape God's Judgments here) from the infinite Priviledges of his Children hereafter, without a sincere and speedy Repentance.

Some other Objections I have endeavour'd to obviate in the Progress of this Essay, and therefore shall only further Declare, that I sincerely believe the Subject of this Discourse to be a Substantial Truth; nay, even a first Principle of Christianity, and that without the courageous Asserting and Vindication therof, the whole Christian Priesthood and the Divine Authority of it, must be call'd in question, (as we see it has lately been in Publick Print) and consequently in time so far deny'd, as to Incourage every bold Intruder to usurp that Sacred Office and Ministry, even in opposition to that Divine Commission, which has been constantly handed down from Christ and his Apostles, to this very Day.

I hope therefore that *None who are vested with this Divine Authority*, will fight a-

gainst it by appearing publickly in opposition to the Subject of this Essay : as for my manner of Arguing to defend it, there may be some *undesign'd Faults* in it, which I humbly submit to their just Correction, and prudent Censure ; hoping they will execute *both*, with so much Wisdom and Conduct, as (to make me see my own Errours, and at the same time) not to prejudice, but add Strength and Cogency to the Cause I have pleaded, which ought by no means to suffer for my *Weakness* in its Defence.

AS for the mere Pretenders to this Divine Authority, I have nothing to say to them or their Followers ; but only to desire 'em to take care not to deceive themselves, but seriously to enquire whether there is any Legality in that Commission, by which they Act ; which till they can *solidly* prove, I shall always esteem to be utterly Invalid for the Administration of Christian Sacraments. I shall not trouble my self to enter the Lists with them, tho' they quarrel never so much with what I have said ; they have Work enough already cut out to their Hands, in those excellent Books which I have mention'd in my Answer to the 3d Objection ; and to

their Arguments. I refer them for the **Divine Right of Episcopacy** that they may save themselves the trouble of demanding them from me.

IF they shall oppose my assertion of the Necessity of a Divine Commission to Administer Baptism, they will thereby Confound themselves when they affirm that they Baptize by Virtue of such a Commission : And then I shall not think them worth my Answering.

I conclude all with my hearty Prayers to Almighty God, that this my weak endeavour may be for his Glory, and that he would keep us from all **False Doctrine, Heresie and Schism**; that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the **way of Truth**, and hold the Faith in Unity of Spirit, in the Bond of Peace, and in Righteousness of Life; and that he would be pleas'd to **Illuminate All Bishops, Priests and Deacons**, with true Knowledge and Understanding of his Word, that both by their Preaching and Living, they may set it forth and shew it accordingly; and rightly and duly Administer **His Holy Sacraments**, that so **Jeroboams Priests** may not **Profane His Service**, but that **The Seed of Aaron** may still **Minister** before him; to whom
with

with his Eternal Son, and Holy Spirit,
 Three Persons, but One God, be ascrib'd, as
 is most due, All Honour, Praise, and Glo-
 ry, Might, Majesty and Dominion, by eve-
 ry Creature that is in Heaven and Earth,
 and under the Earth, For ever and ever,
 Amen.

A P.

APPENDIX.

SINCE the Publication of the First Edition of this Book, I am inform'd, that some Gentlemen of no mean Character, have made further Objections against the Subject therof, which (because they look very plausible at first sight, and may therefore prejudice too many against what I have propos'd) I shall endeavour here to answer, as briefly and plainly as I can.

Obj. IX. AND First 'tis said, that if Lay Baptism be Invalid, and the Divine Commission to Baptize be convey'd from the Apostles in Episcopacy only, then all those Foreign Reform'd Churches which have no Episcopal Ordination are effectually Unchurch'd, as being (by the Principles asserted by me) destitute of a Christian Ministry, and consequently of Christian Baptism, which is a consequence so dreadful, and even contrary to the Concessions of many Episcopal Divines of the Church of *England*, that none ought to admit of that Doctrine, from which (if granted) so great a mischief must necessarily arise.

Answ.

Ans. That Lay Baptism is Null and Void, I humbly conceive, I have prov'd; if not, let the Authors of this Objection shew, either the Insufficiency, or Fallacy of the Arguments I have produc'd for that purpose; otherwise I shall take it for granted, that they acknowledge such Baptisms to be Invalid; or else, that at best they can give no solid Reasons for their Validity. And therefore, till I hear further from them upon this single Topick, I shall give my self no more trouble about it, but proceed to the conveyance of the Divine Commission to Baptize, and this (supposing Lay Baptism to be Invalid) can be convey'd from the Apostles in the Christian Ministry only; so that all our Business here, is to know how the Christian Ministry was handed down, and successively continued from the Apostles to our Days, and this will determine who can Administer Valid Baptism.

T H A T the Christian Ministry was conveyed from the Apostles in Episcopacy only, we have a Cloud of Witnesses; First, the Practice of the Apostles, recorded in the Sacred Oracles of infallible Truth and the Holy Scriptures; Secondly, all Ecclesiastical History; and Thirdly, the constant and uninterrupted Practice of the Universal

Universal Church of Christ in all Ages and Places, for One Thousand Five Hundred Years together from the Apostles Days. These all bear testimony to this great Truth, as has been sufficiently demonstrated by a vast number of the best Christian Writers, particularly some of our own Nation, and that very lately, (*vid. Those I have mention'd in Answer to the 3d Objection, and another Entitled, The Divine Right of Episcopacy, Printed for Richard Save, at Grays-Inn-Gate in Holborn, 1708,*) who have obviated and answer'd the Objections of all Enemies so excellently well, that it would be no less than Presumption in me, to attempt to say any thing more upon that Subject, after such Learned Authors; to whom therefore I refer the Reader for his satisfaction in this Point, and pass on to consider the Objection it self.

IF then the Premises above mention'd be true; If Lay Baptism be Invalid, &c. then (says the Objector) "*all those Foreign Reform'd Churches, &c. are effectually Unchurch'd, being destitute of a Christian Ministry, and consequently of Christian Baptism.*" Why truly, if those Foreign Reform'd are Unchurch'd upon the truth of those Premises, I cannot help that, 'tis the Objector

Objector himself that tells me they are so; and I know of no way for him to help them out of that Difficulty at present, but either to prove the Premises false; or else to persuade them to receive Episcopal Ordination. But 'tis said, "*this is a dreadful consequence* : It may be so, and very dreadful too, if they are so far Unchurch'd as to be reduc'd to a state of absolute Infidels, which I hope the Objector does not mean when he says they are Unchurch'd, if he does, I must tell him, that (tho' I am no Latitudinarian) I have more charitable Thoughts concerning Thousands of them than he has, upon the supposition of their being destitute of Christian Baptism: for I believe abundance of them may be included in the Number of those, whom I have spoke of in the Words of a most Excellent modern Author, (*towards the End of my Answer to the Fourth Objection*) and that therefore they may very fairly be esteem'd **as much in the Church** as the Catechumeni, or Candidates for Christian Baptism, were us'd to be in the Primitive times. This I think abates much of the dreadfulness of the Consequence to the Honest and Sincere; but it cannot be hence infer'd, that their Ministry and Administrations are Good and Valid, or that

thole

those who know their Defects should concur and communicate with 'em in such their Deviations from the Divine Institutes.

BUT (to proceed) this says the Objector, is "even contrary to the Concessions of many Episcopal Divines of the Church of England. I suppose he means some of the Writers since the Reformation, who have endeavour'd to make Excuses and Salvo's for the Presbyterian and Lay Ordinations abroad. In reference to whom I must needs say, that 'tis justly to be fear'd, they have done more hurt by such their Concessions, than at the time of their writing them they were aware of; for 'tis not to be doubted, that many put a great value upon the Judgment of such Learned and Good Men, and therby have been induc'd to believe that such Ordinations are Good and Valid, and consequently that ther's no need for those Foreign Reformed to seek for Episcopal Ordination, wherby too many of the Foreign Teachers themselves, are instead of being cur'd of, confirm'd in their Errors, and it may be hinder'd from so much, as but enquiring whether they are in the right or no. With submission to better judgments, such large Concessions of those *many Episcopal Divines*,
have

have been not only Prejudicial and Hurtful to the Reform'd abroad, but even contrary to the Doctrine and avow'd Practice of the Church of *England*, which they were oblig'd. in conscience by their Subscription, to support and maintain. For, does she not teach in her 23. Article, that "*It is not lawful (therefore 'tis sinful and contrary to their Institution) for any Man to take up- on him the Office of Ministering the Sacra- ments before he be lawfully Call'd and Sent?*" And does she not confine this **lawful Calling and Sending to Episcopal Ordination**, in the Preface to her Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests and Deacons? Does she not call this **Episcopal Ordination, Christ's Commission and Authority**, when in her 26th Article she teaches, that the Minister when he Administers the Sacraments does it "*in Christ's Name, and by his Commission and Authority?*" Is she not so exactly consistent to all this, that she will not admit any of these Foreign Teachers into the Number of her Priests, no nor of her Deacons neither, without Episcopal Ordination? Is not all this so true that none can deny it? And does she not thereby, as much as may be, prevent all such Concessions, and reprove those who make them,

them, contrary to her Doctrine and Practice? I think she does, and consequently that her Articles, are not of so loose and variable a Contexture as some (who ought to know better) have represented them to be, (like a Nose of Wax) that may be wrested to serve any turn, and defend almost all Contradictious Doctrines and Practices whatsoever, without considering that her Articles, Rubricks, and Canons, &c. when duly compar'd with one another, do make the most perfect Harmony and Agreement, and have nothing in them that is either Contradictory or Inconsistent to themselves, or disagreeable to the Holy Scriptures, and Practice of the Primitive Church.

I F in the Days of *Jeroboam* the Son of *Nebat*, who made Israel to Sin, a Priest of the Tribe of *Aaron* should have undertaken to defend the Validity of the Priesthood, which *Jeroboam* had set up, would he not have been justly censurable, would he not have acted contrary to the Principles of the true Church of the *Jews* at *Jerusalem*? Certainly he would, notwithstanding the vastly superior Numbers in the Ten Tribes who forsook the true Priests, and the smallness of the Numbers in the Two other Tribes, who would not follow that

K

Multitude

Malitude to do this Evil. And the reason why he would have been justly blameable is evident, because *Jeroboam made Priests of the Lowest of the People which were not of the Sons of Levi, 1 Kings 12. 31.* For that this (as well as their Idolatry) was his and the Ten Tribes Sin is evident by *Abijah's* speech to them, (2 Chron. 13. 9, 10) *Have ye not cast out the Priests of the Lord, the Sons of Aaron and the Levites, and have made you Priests after the manner of the Nations of other Lands, &c. But as for us (i. e. the Members of the true Church of God, the other Two Tribes of Israel) The Lord is our God, &c. and the Priests which Minister unto the Lord are the Sons of Aaron, and the Levites wait upon their Business.* Here you see that *Abijah* Triumphs and Glories in the true Priesthood with them, because 'twas that which God himself appointed; and he upbraids the Ten Tribes for their having set up other Priests, without any regard to the Divine Institution of the Priesthood; their mighty Numbers, and the seeming necessity of their being forc'd thereto by the Secular Power, was no Argument for him to allow of their Priesthood. How much less ought those Writers among us, to have studied so industriously, as some of them have

have done, to prove the Validity of their Ministry, who are not one tenth of the present Universal Church, and who differ from them and the whole Church throughout all Ages, in not requiring their Ministers to be Vested with the Divine Authority by Episcopal Ordination.

I AM well aware of what is pleaded by those *Episcopal Divines*, viz. That these Foreign Reform'd were under a Case of Necessity, and some of them say, they are so still. But I am not yet satisfied what they mean by this Case of Necessity; The Church of *England*, wherof those Episcopal Divines are Members, has not declar'd it: the Scripture is wholly silent about it, and on the contrary, has recorded the dreadful Punishments inflicted upon some, who to all appearance had a great deal of Reason to plead, that they were under great Circumstances of Necessity, to assume to themselves those Offices, wherein they ministred contrary to the Divine Institutions; as in the Cases of *Saul*, 1 *Sam.* 13. from *verse* 8. to *verse* 14. and *Uzzab*, 2 *Sam.* 6. 6, 7. So that I am utterly at a Loss to know, how those Writers could discover any Case of Necessity, that *of it self* was sufficient to Authorize Men, to take upon them the Great Office

of mediating between God and Man. There is not one Instance (that I know of) in all the sacred Oracles, of any one's being instated into such an Office, even in the greatest Cases of Necessity, without an explicit Revelation of God's Will, that the Man should act therein, when the ordinary appointed means of giving him his Commission was wanting. And if the Excusers of those Foreign Ordinations can shew me such an Instance, I shall be very much oblig'd to them if they will be pleas'd to do it.

N A Y further, supposing that 'twere possible to determine a Case of Necessity, that might be sufficient to empower Men to Administer Valid Sacraments, without receiving a Commission for so doing, by God's appointed means of Episcopal Ordination, yet I dont find that any of the abovesaid Writers have proved by good Arguments, that the said Foreigners were ever under such a Case of Necessity, *much less that they are so now*; and till this is prov'd, I see no reason to be at all concluded by the Writings of even the best of Men, who are not guided in their Dictates by the infallible Spirit of Truth, as the Blessed Apostles and Prophets were.

I KNOW that some do beg the Question, by supposing, "What if the Episcopal Order were utterly Extinct, and no Bishops could be found to confer Holy Orders; must ther be no Ministers therefore in the Christian Church? and must the Visible Church of Christ cease to have a Being as such in the World? This at first proposing looks to be a very weighty Question, but when we justly reflect on the Divine Veracity which has infallibly assur'd us, *that Christ will be with his Apostles, (i. e. them and their Successors, the Bishops,) alway even unto the End of the World;* and that *the Gates of Hell shall never prevail against the Church;* then the Impertinence and Folly of this [*What if*] does immediately discover it self, because it supposes, what in fact never was, nor ever will be, and therefore needs no answering because not to be granted. But alas! supposing that it were (as it is not) possible, for the Church to be universally depriv'd of her Spiritual Fathers the Bishops, 'tis our Duty as well as Safety, rather to wait and hope for, some New Revelation of his Will for another Institution of Men to succeed in the Christian Priesthood, than to take it upon our selves, by such Ways and Means as he has

not hitherto appointed, and which will *therefore* prove ineffectual for the *supernatural* Purposes of his own Divine Institutions; (because **Man** by his own Authority only, can never make a Human equal to a Divine Institution) but this Case has never happen'd yet, and therefore, no Society of Men either past or present, can be at all excus'd upon this suppos'd Foundation.

AND now to conclude, all that I have to say to this Objection, no Doctrine whatsoever can be prov'd to be false, by the Mischiefs of those Consequences which necessarily arise from it, when those Consequences themselves are not contradictory to some *previous Truths*; and when Men by either their wilful Sins, or supine Neglects, are *the only causes* of the Mischiefs of those Consequences, for which Truth and its Assertors are no ways answerable. This I believe is a Maxim that will stand the Test of a strict Examination, and hold good in the Case before us: And I pray God to touch the Hearts of those who are concern'd in it, with a due sense of their Deviations from his Holy Institutes, that they may compleat *a thorow Reformation*; that the Christian Priesthood may recover its Antient Spiritual Glory; and that we
may

may be all blest'd with the Happiness of a Universal Communion of Saints here in the Church Militant, so as to be intitled to an entire and eternal Union and Communion with the Church triumphant in the Kingdom of Heaven.

Obj. X. 'Tis further Objected; that if Lay Baptism be Invalid, then all those who never receiv'd any other Baptism are incapable of Holy Orders, having never been Baptiz'd; and therefore the Orders of several Episcopally Ordained Persons among us are Null and Void, and consequently so are all their Ministerial Acts too, because they never receiv'd any other than Lay Baptism. This will involve the Church into the utmost confusion; and therefore the Invalidity of Lay Baptism ought not to be allow'd by any, who value the Order and Peace of the Church.

Answ. THIS Objection raises a Consequence from an uncertain, and it may be a false Foundation; for it takes for granted, that the Incapacity of a Person to receive Holy Orders, by reason of his being Unbaptiz'd, renders Holy Orders, if confer'd on him, Null and Void; or in short, that *want of Baptism Nulls Holy Orders in any Person Ordain'd to the Ministry.* This Assertion does not yet appear

case, if at all to be prov'd, for these following Reasons.

1st. Because ther is a vast difference between a Personal Capacity or Qualification, and an Authoritative One. For, a *Personal Qualification*, for the Ministry, is, what a Man is bound to be endow'd with, **in Common** with all other Christians, whether he be ordain'd to the Ministry or no; and therefore Baptism and Holiness of Life being equally incumbent on all Christians, Ministers as well as Lay-Men, may *justly* be distinguish'd by the Name of *Personal Qualifications*.

BUT an *Authoritative Qualification* for the Ministry is that only, wherby a Man is *separated* and *distinguish'd* from the rest of Mankind, and therby empower'd to *Personate* and *Represent* the Divine Presence, for the conveyance of Spiritual and Supernatural Benefits to us. This is what we call the Divine Commission, convey'd from the Apostles in Episcopacy, and given to the Ordain'd Person by Imposition of the Bishop's Hands.

2^{dly}, A **PERSONAL** *Qualification* may be, and in fact often is *wanting*, when an *Authoritative One* remains Good and Valid; and ther's abundance of Reason that it should be so, because, the *Personal Qualifi-*

Qualification chiefly respects the Man himself, who is, or ought to be, possess'd of it, since he only will reap the benefit of having, or find the misery of being destitute of it. But the *Authoritative Qualification* as such, relates only to God, and the People; to God, as the Minister is to be his *Proxy* and *Representative*; and to the People as they are to receive from God the Supernatural Benefits of his *Proxy's* Ministrations. The People receive no more advantage from the Personal Qualification of God's Representative, than they do mischief from his *Personal Immoralities*; that is, none at all, because they are neither answerable for the one or the other: if he be destitute of any such Qualifications, let him look to that, 'tis none of their business with respect to the Efficacy of his Ministrations: all that they are bound to take care of, is, that he be **truly Sent**, and if they are but once secure of that, then in all his Ministrations they are not to suppose him, but Christ himself (*whom he Personates*) to be Administring to them; for, all Sacraments *on the Part of the Administration* are Good and Valid, only upon this **One foundation**; without this, of Christ the Great High Priest's Administring, either himself

himself in Person or by his Proxy, all Christian Sacraments must fall to the Ground, and be of no use or advantage to Mankind; and therefore if we can but solidly, *i. e.* upon good foundation, believe, that *he* does thus Administer to us, we need never concern our selves with the *Personal Qualifications* of his Representative, for the Validity of those Administrations, which receive their whole Efficacy from the *Authoritative Qualifications* of Christ himself, who has promis'd to make good and confirm them when perform'd by *one whom he has sent.*

TO Exemplify all this in the Case before us; Holiness of Life is Requir'd as a Personal Qualification, Previous to Holy Orders: this is evident from St. Paul's Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*; and yet 'tis well known, that our Lord himself chose *Judas Iscariot*, a covetous Thief, and one whom he himself branded with the Name of *a Devil*; I say, 'tis well known, that he chose this wicked Wretch to be no less than *an Apostle*, and sent *him* to Preach and Baptize, to cast out Devils, and to heal the Sick, as well as the rest of the Apostles; for which reason, all his Ministerial Acts were Good and Valid, notwithstanding his being destitute of the *Personal Qualificati-*

on

on of Holiness of Life; and 'tis universally acknowledg'd, that the same is true of all other wicked Bishops, Priests, and Deacons whatsoever, otherwise, we could never be satisfied with the Validity of Ordinations in any Age of Christianity. And therefore, tho' Holiness of Life is a *necessary Personal Qualification* for the Ministry, because of great Edification to the People, &c. yet if a truly Ordained Minister should be a wicked Man, the People ought not to suspect the Validity of his Ministrations by reason of the wickedness of his Life, because, 'tis Christ that Administers by him as *his Proxy only*, and Christ's Ministrations are certainly Good and Valid; let his visible Representative be never so wicked, he himself (and not the People) must answer for that. This is exactly agreeable to the 26th Article of the Church of *England*, and therefore ther is no need longer to insist upon it, but to proceed to Baptism, another *Personal Qualification* for Holy Orders.

IT is certainly the indispensable Duty of *Every Minister* to be Baptiz'd, as well as to be personally Holy, because 'tis a Divine Law to which all ought to pay Obedience. For which reason I cannot omit commending the laudable Custom of
the

the Church of *Rome*, who, (tho' Corrupt and Scandalously wicked in other Matters, yet) requires her Candidates for Holy Orders to prove their Baptism, before they can be admitted into the Ministry : and I should heartily rejoyce to see the Governours of our Church require the same of her Candidates for the Ministerial Function, who, 'tis to be fear'd, ever since the Reformation, have never been enjoyn'd to bring Certificates of their Baptism, as well as of their good Behaviour and Christian Conversation. This Omission, I charitably believe, proceeded only from an Opinion, *that none would presume to enter into Holy Orders before they were Baptiz'd, and that therefore 'twas needless to require a Proof of their Baptism* : But however, if this Custom had been preserv'd, 'tis reasonable to believe, that our Ministers would (some of them) have been more strict in keeping their *Parish Registers* of Persons Baptiz'd by Lawfully Ordain'd Ministers, and not have suffer'd Schismatical *Lay Baptisms* to have been Register'd among the *True Baptisms*, as 'tis now scandalously practic'd in some Places, to the great grief of many, and I hope almost all our Divines, who have constantly oppos'd all such *unwarrantable Practices*, and will (to their Praise be it spoken)

spoken) never suffer such *Registers* to be made in their Parish Books. I say, if this good Custom of requiring Certificates of their Baptism had been continued, 'tis very likely, that no Lay Baptiz'd Person would have got such a Certificate, from the Minister of any Parish; because such a Minister's giving such a Certificate, would have been a publishing of his own fault, in making such a Register as is contrary to the Laws and Customs of the Church; for he must have mention'd the Lay-man's Name, who was said to have Baptiz'd the Person, and therby have declar'd, that he himself took part with *Schismaticks*, and consequently must have incurr'd the Penalties of the 10th and 57th Canons of the Church of England; and this might have been an effectual means of preserving our Registers entire, and consequently of keeping out of the Ministry, those who receiv'd Baptism from Lay Preachers; no other Lay-men being at least now so presumptuous, as once to pretend to Baptize. But this only by way of Digression.

A N D now to return, Christian Baptism is certainly a *Personal Qualification* for Holy Orders; and that it is no more than a *Personal One*, I infer from hence, because all Christians are *equally* bound to
be

be Baptiz'd, Ministers as well as People; and it cannot be prov'd, that it is more the duty of the one than of the other to be Baptiz'd: if it be said yes it is, because ther must of necessity be a Christian Minister, before ther can be a Baptiz'd Lay-man; this is not deny'd; it is certainly true ther must be so; but it does not therefore follow that he is not a Christian Minister if he is Unbaptiz'd; for 'tis not his Baptism, but the Commission that makes him a Christian Minister, *or one set apart to Minister in the Divine Offices of the Christian Religion.* If it be objected, that while he is Unbaptiz'd he is out of the Church; and how can he who is not of the Church, admit another by Baptism into the Church? I answer, tho' he is out of the Church with respect to any Benefits to himself, yet not with respect to the Spiritual Benefit; he has Authority and Commission *mediately* to convey to others; for, a Man may be a *True Messenger* to carry that Good to another, which he himself neither does nor ever will enjoy; and therefore, he who is not of the Church because Unbaptiz'd, may *as truly* admit a Person into the Church by Baptism, as he who (tho' Baptiz'd) thro' his Wickedness, is destitute of the Holy Ghost, can convey the Gift of the Holy Ghost

Ghost by his Ministration of Sacraments to others: for, as 'tis not the *Personal Holiness* of the Administrator, that conveys Holiness to me in the Ministration of any Sacrament; so neither, does his having *receiv'd* that Sacrament, signify any thing to me for the Validity therof, when he Administers it to me *by virtue of a Divine Commission explicitly given to him*. This **Commission alone**, is that which makes the Ministration not his, but God's own Act, and as such (*without any other Appendant Cause*) 'tis Good and Valid. Hence our Blessed Lord call'd both Unbaptiz'd and Unholy Men, *viz.* his Apostles, who cannot be prov'd to *have been Baptiz'd in the Name of the Trinity* before his Resurrection; and one of them, *Judas Iscariot*, a Thief, a Devil in his Disposition, to the Administration of Holy Things, as if he would thereby teach us, to look with Faith on **his Authority only**, without confiding in any of the best Accomplishments of those on whom he has confer'd it. And if we do but look back to the Condition of the Jewish Church, during their forty Years sojourning in the Wilderness, we shall find that none of them were Circumcis'd in all that space of time; and tho' the Uncircumcis'd was by God's own Appointment

pointment to be cut off from among his People, yet the Ministry of those Priests and Levites, who were born in the term of those Forty Years, was not Null'd and made Void for their want of Circumcision; which doubtless was as much necessary to qualify them for Holy Orders, as Baptism is now to qualify our Christian Priests.

UPON the whole, as neither the *Baptism*, nor *Personal Holiness* of the Minister can *Baptize* or make us *Holy*, but **the Divine Authority** residing in him; so neither, can the *Baptism* or *Personal Holiness* of the Bishop confer Holy Orders, but **the Divine Authority** from Christ and his Apostles, visibly convey'd to and residing in him: 'tis by virtue of **this alone** that Holy Orders are given, and if either the Bishop or Ordain'd Person, or both, have any *Personal Incapacity*, viz. of Wick- edness or want of Baptism, the Fault is their own, and they must answer for it; but as for the Ordination, that must remain Good and Valid, by reason of the External Divine Commission *de facto* given to the Bishop. For, if every *Personal Defect* of what is requir'd, either in the Administrator or Recipient, could Invalidate the Administration, either of Baptism or Holy Orders, we should never have an end

End of Rebaptizations and Reordinations :
Nay, we could never have any certainty,
either of Valid Baptisms or Ordinations,
because we should always find but too ma-
ny Occasions, to call in question the Suffi-
ciency of the Preparations, and Personal
Qualifications of both Ministers and Peo-
ple, who are all equally expos'd to the
same Human Frailties, and lyable to be
try'd with the same innumerable Temp-
tations.

AND therefore I humbly conceive, our
best way is (I don't say *only* but) *chiefly*
to regard, and insist on the Visible Divine
Authority and Commission, handed down
from Christ and his Apostles, by that
Order of Men, who have *always* had
power to convey it to others; this, with
the *Right Matter*, and *Form* of Admini-
stration, are what we ought to esteem to
be the *only Essentials* of Baptism and Or-
dination, on the part of the Administrati-
on of them; and as for the rest, every
one in particular must do his part to the
utmost of his Power, to secure those Per-
sonal Qualifications, which God has re-
quir'd of both Minister and People, under
no less penalty than that of Eternal Dam-
nation, upon the wilful neglect of them.

L

THUS

T H U S far I have presum'd to declare
 my Thoughts, concerning the Uncertainty
 and (as far as I can see) the Falseness of
 the Foundation, upon which this whole
 Objection is rais'd, humbly submitting all
 I have said in opposition to it, to the better
 Reasons and Arguments of my Superiors,
 the truly Ordain'd Ministers of Jesus Christ,
 whether Bishops, Priests, or Deacons, sin-
 cerely declaring, that if any thing has
 drop'd from me, that is contrary to the
 Truth of Christianity, I do hereby Re-
 ceive it, and will do so in a more particular
 manner, as soon as I can discover my
 Error. *and now, whether what I have said*
against Ordinations, and Holy Minis-
trations being Null'd for want of Baptism, be
true or no; if the Invalidity of Lay Bap-
tism be a Truth, let every one take care to
keep himself from the mischievous Conse-
quences of it. And if the Nulling of Ho-
ly Orders, and Ministrations, be a real
Consequence of this Truth, then ther's no
other Remedy, but that those who are in-
volv'd in it, should extricate themselves
out of it, by Episcopal Baptism and Reordi-
nation. It is not enough to say, that
"This will involve the Church into the ut-
"most Confusion; for, want of Baptism and

a Valid Ministry is the most pernicious Confusion, and infinitely greater than what can proceed from such Persons receiving valid Baptism and Holy Orders; and therefore, if the Premises are true the Risk must be run, for Truths of so great Importance must not be stifled, and made to give way to suppos'd ~~conclusions~~; because, whatsoever mischief may arise, can never be the Result of Divine Truth (which is always Good and Beneficial) but of Mens Sins and Impieties, in usurping those Sacred Offices, which they never receiv'd any Commission to Act in. So that those who value the Order and Peace of the Church, ought not to disallow of the Invalidity of Lay Baptism, upon the Account of this Consequence, but rather to enquire seriously, whether Divine Revelation gives us any Foundation to believe, that such Baptisms are Good and valid; and if they are not, whether the Nulling of Holy Orders be a real Consequence thereof; and if it be, they should assert and maintain it to the utmost of their power, nay even to Martyrdom it self, if the defending such a Truth did expose them to it, rather than suffer themselves to be destitute both of a *Christian Priesthood*, and *Christian Baptism*.

Obi. XI, BUT others say, that to avoid the fatal Consequences of adhering too rigorously to this Doctrine of Lay Baptisms being Invalid, the " Authority of the
 " Powers Hierarchial are very Divine, and
 " the same which Christ had, not to the violation of his Laws, but to **dispense** with
 " them to **Edification**, for which they may
 " be empower'd to Relax stated Rules, in cases
 " that appear necessary or expedient. And that therefore, tho' Heretical, Schismatical,
 " and Adimical Baptisms are done without,
 " nay, and against the consent of the Hierarchy, and therefore are not intire, or
 " valid in themselves, yet they are made so
 " on the Post-Fact, by the Spiritual Powers,
 " so far, as that the External Rite shall not
 " be Reiterated; but as to any Spiritual
 " Graces they are not to be had thereby, till
 " those defective and Irregular Acts are supply'd, Righted and Confirmed, by the Chrism
 " of the Bishop, or Imposition of his Hands,
 " or such Rite by which he shall fix the Person
 " Baptiz'd into a State of Canonical Union with the Church. So also, the Validity of Lay Baptism, " as well to its Internal, as External Priviledges, stands on
 " the Authority of the Church's Power to
 " grant such License to Lay-men in Extremities. All which being consider'd, Lay-
 Baptisms

Baptisms ought now to be acknowledg'd Valid, especially to such as have been confirm'd by the Bishop.

Answ. **THIS** Objection is for the most part in the very Words of a Learned and Reverend Opposer, of One of the most Poysonous Books that, it may be, was ever suffer'd to be Publish'd in the Christian World, *fully Intitul'd, the Rights of the Christian Church asserted*. The worthy Author, who has done the Church good Service, in answering that pernicious Book, I dare say, never designed, that any thing in his most Excellent Book should be constru'd to favour our Lay-Baptisms, which are evidently *in opposition* to the Divine Right of Episcopacy, and for which our Hierarchial Powers have provided **no Act of Confirmation**. So that in these Nations, Our Lay Baptizers and their Profelytes, can reap no benefit by any thing asserted in this Objection.

I HAVE already, under the Corollary of the Third Proposition, declar'd my Reasons against the dispensing Power plead- ed in this Objection; to which I shall further add, That I acknowledge *the Divine Powers of the Hierarchy*, but with this Restriction, that since the settling of the Canon of the Holy Scriptures, they are

for ever limited in **Things fundamental** to that Rule, from which they have no Authority to Deviate, and consequently not to *dispense* with any of the Essentials of Baptism, which without all doubt is a Fundamental of Christianity; such a *Dispensation* must be a *Violation* of Christ's Law, and how that should be to *Edification*, is inconceivable, since Christ our Great Law-Giver, has provided Fundamentals, sufficient for the Edification of his Church in all circumstances whatsoever; and obedience to his Laws about Fundamentals, is most certainly the best Edification; otherwise, He who is Omniscient, Wisdom it self, would never have made such Laws: and therefore with submission, there seems to be no necessity for impowering the Governours of the Church to *Relax his stated Rules*, no not in Cases that appear *necessary or expedient*. Besides, if Christ has made stated Rules for the Essentials of Christian Sacraments, without providing for such pretended Cases of Necessity, the Hierarchial Powers must certainly run a great hazard of Sin, in attempting to dispense with things, for which he has made no Provision; and the Persons dispens'd with can have *no just satisfaction* in such Dispensations, especially when the
 seeming

seeming cause of them is removed, as it certainly is in the case of Persons baptized by Laymen, contrary to the stated Rule who may afterwards obtain Episcopal Baptism agreeable to the Law of Christ, if the Hierarchial Powers will but give them leave.

THIS I say in opposition to those who affirm, that the Hierarchial Powers are actually endowed with Authority to "dispense with Christ's Laws, and to Relax stated Rules, in cases that appear necessary & expedient;" which the Learned Author, whose Words they use, does not say. All that he intimates is only, that they may be empower'd to do so; which plainly shews, that he would not venture to affirm that they really are; and 'tis reasonable to believe, that upon second Thoughts he will not allow so much, as that they may be so empower'd; because what may be, may not be, as far as we know: nay, 'tis more agreeable to reveal'd Religion to say, that they are not so empower'd; because, a thing of so great moment would never have been left out of the Divine Oracles, to be handed down to us thro' all Ages, by the uncertain method of Tradition only; and therefore, 'tis very unsafe for us to trust in such [may be's] when the Re-

ceiving, or not Receiving, of *Spiritual Supernatural Priviledges and Benefits*, depends upon the Truth or Falsity of such a dispensing Power, as it certainly does in the Administration of Christian Sacraments. "*Heretical, Schismatical and Mimical Baptisms*, are in this Objection acknowledg'd to be " *not Entire or Valid in themselves*, therefore in themselves they are utterly and entirely Invalid (*by the Corollary of the 3d Proposition.*) It is also agreed, that " *as to any Spiritual Graces they are not to be had, thereby till &c.* which is a plain Indication, that of **themselves** they are of *no Efficacy* to the Purposes of Christian Baptism, the Administration whereof is certainly efficacious for the conveyance of Spiritual Graces. Again, they are call'd here "*Defective and Irregular Acts*. But why are they *Defective*, except but for their being incapable of producing the proper Effects of true Baptism? And why should they be term'd *Irregular Acts*, except only but for being contrary to the stated Rule (or which is the same) the First Institution of Christian Baptism?

SO that the *External Rite* perform'd by these *Heretical, Schismatical and Mimical Baptizers*, being thus acknowledg'd to be contrary to the Institution of Baptism, and
utterly

utterly incapable in it self, of being the means to convey any *Spiritual Graces* what has it to do with Christian Baptism? certainly it must be a mere Nullity, and all one as if it had never been perform'd, because, if it had no virtue to confer *Spiritual Graces*, it had no virtue to confer any *Benefit* at all; for, even the outward Priviledges are no Priviledges, when separate from the *Spiritual Graces*. Thus, all Persons, on whom the said *External Rite* was perform'd, can receive by means thereof, none of the Benefits of Christian Baptism, which are all *Spiritual* and *Supernatural*, and consequently must remain in the State of the Unbaptiz'd, till they receive true Christian Baptism; which how they can receive without repeating the *External Rite* by a proper Administrator, is utterly inconceivable. It is said indeed, that "*those Defective and Irregular Acts, (i. e. the External Rites of those Heretical, Schismatical and Mimical Baptisms) are Supply'd, Righted, and Confirm'd, by the Chrism of the Bishop, or Imposition of his Hands, &c.*" For answer to which, I refer the Reader to *the Corollary of the 3d Proposition*; & further add, that this is only said and not prov'd; and I believe never will, till it can be demonstrated that, that which before was

was no Baptism at all in the Christian sense of the Word, is now made true Christian Baptism (without the Act of Baptization) merely by the Bishop's Chrism, or Imposition of his Hands. Either the first External Rite was the **One Baptism** the Scripture speaks of, or it was not; if it was, then it was Entire and Valid Baptism, and consequently wants no such Act of the Bishop to supply and right it; but if it was not that **One Baptism**, then nothing can make it so, but the very Act of Baptization by a Christian Minister: for it may with as much reason be affirm'd, that Baptism is Administer'd really and truly by such Acts of the Bishop, to all other Unbaptiz'd Persons as well as to those; and so at last, Baptism it self will be render'd needless, when the want of it can be so easily supply'd: but no less than a Divine Revelation will suffice to convince us, that this is true, and till that is produc'd we must continue to believe, that not all the Acts of the highest created Powers on Earth, are sufficient to make that which before was no Baptism, to become Christian Baptism, without the Act of Baptization by a proper Minister, as Christ has appointed in the Institution: And that consequently, those who never Receiv'd any other than

Lay

Lay Baptism are still Unbaptiz'd, notwithstanding their being suppos'd to have been confirm'd by the Bishop. As for the *Validity of Lay Baptism*, that it "stands on the Authority of the Church's Power, to grant such License to Lay-men in Extremities; when it can be prov'd, that Christ has Vested his Church with such a Power, it will necessarily follow, that Lay Baptism, in Cases of Extremity, must be Valid upon that Foundation; but even then, our Ordinary Lay Baptism must be Null and Void, because they are destitute of the Plea of Necessity in a Country where Christian Priests are to be had; and therefore, 'tis in vain to claim any Benefit from the suppos'd Power of the Church, because she her self has not Authority to exercise this Power, except in Extremities, which God be prais'd we do not yet labour under. But after all, 'tis dangerous to allow, that this Power was ever given to the Church for Cases of Extremity, because, such a Power would be an Occasion of destroying the very Unity of the Church, and expose her to the endless Divisions, and Separations, which Hereticks and Schismatics would make from her: for, if by virtue of this suppos'd Power, she should once make a Canon to License Lay-men

men to Administer Valid Baptism in Cases of Extremity, then such dividing Hereticks and Schismatics, calling their pretended *Scruples*, and *Tendernesses of Conscience*, by the Name of **Cases of extremity**, would establish the Validity of their Lay Administrations, upon the Authority of the Church from whom they separate, and vindicate their Oppositions to her, by the Power which she in such case would *implicitly* give to them. And so every private Person, after having blinded his Understanding by hearkening to False Teachers, might plead, that he was under a **Necessity** to separate from the Church, by reason that he cannot overcome his *Scruples* about her Doctrine and Worship; And therefore might join himself to any Congregation he should like best, without the least fear of dividing from the Church, because, *where true Sacraments and the Word of God are, there must be a true Church*; and he could find proper Sacraments Administer'd in these New Congregationseven by Lay Administrators, who Act by *the Authority of the Church her self*. This is to build the Church and its Unity upon so precarious a Foundation, that we shall never know what Schism and causeless Separation mean, tho' the Scripture

tells

tells us *ther are and will be such Sins*, and the Apostles pronouncing Damnation upon those who are guilty of such Sins (*Gal. 5. 20, 21.*) will have no force and efficacy upon Men's Consciences, when they can once perswade themselves (as they too often do) that they separate for *Necessity*, and can upon that *very Account* receive Valid Sacraments from Lay Hands; and then 'twill be in vain to say, that such Lay Administrations must be confirm'd by the Bishop before they can be Valid Sacraments; for it will be demanded, by what Authority the Bishop requires such Administrations to be confirm'd by him? and if good Testimonials from Holy Scripture are not produc'd for this purpose, the Bishop's *Supplying and Righting* such Irregular Acts will be made a Jest of; and the *Separatists* will conclude themselves as much in the Church as the Bishop himself, while they Administer and Receive as good Sacraments as he, since he cannot prove their Lay Administrations *necessary* to be Confirm'd, Righted and Supply'd, by imposition of his Hands, &c. On the contrary, if it had but been constantly asserted and defended, *That the Sacraments of the Christian Church are by Institution of such a Nature, that the Christian Priesthood is one Inseparable and*
Essential

Essential part of them, or, that the Divine Authority of the Administrator, is **as much** and as durable a part of their Institution, as the very matter, or outward Elements of them. If Men had been always taught, that in the Sacraments, the Priest is **as much** the Representative of God the Giver, as the outward Elements are of the Graces given, and that consequently, these Sacraments are no Christian Sacraments when separate from God's Authority & Representative the Priest. And that the Church her self cannot by any Authority given to her, alter the Nature of these things. If these Topics had been constantly insisted on, without Trimming to please any Party of Hereticks or Schismatics whatsoever, 'Tis more than probable, that Men would have been much more tender of the Unity of the Church, and more cautious of separating from her, than now we find they are, since how far soever their vain Curiosity might have prompted them to have followed New fangled Lay Teachers to please their itching Ears, yet the consideration of their being **destitute of Christian Sacraments**, might have terrified them from withdrawing from the Communion of the Christian Priesthood, and thereby have prevented, at least, many of those final Separations from the only salutary

Communion,

Communion, which abundance of poor Wretches have fallen into, meerly thro' the false notion of better Edification, and vain belief of being sure to find true Christian Sacraments in communion with their *New-ferried Lay Teachers*. And 'tis justly to be fear'd, that the continual separations from the Church in all Ages, and particularly in ours, have chiefly sprung from this wretched Opinion of the meer *Opus Operatum* of Sacraments being real Sacraments, whether Administer'd by a Priest or a Lay Man, as if Christ's appointing the Order of Priesthood in the Christian Church, signify'd nothing at all, notwithstanding 'twas the result of the most consummate Wisdom of our Great Law-giver.

BUT, because 'tis pleaded from Scripture Instances, that Cases of Necessity and Extremity, have taken place of Divine Institutions, and that therefore Baptism, in Cases of extream Necessity, may be Validly Administer'd by a Lay-man, notwithstanding the Institution requires it to be Administer'd by a Priest: and forasmuch, as many Lay-baptiz'd Persons encourage themselves by supposing theirs to be a Case of Necessity, and consequently that they have receiv'd true Christian Baptism,

tism, I shall therefore, in answer to the next Objection shew, that those Instances produc'd from Scripture are not parallel to Christian Baptism, and that ther is nothing in them that can favour Lay Baptism, even in Cases of greatest Extremity.

Obj. XII. IN the Institution of the Passover, it was appointed that the Jews should eat the Paschal Lamb *"with their Loins girded, their Shoes on their Feet, and their Staff in their Hand, Exod. 12. 11.* which signifies a standing Posture: The Church of the Jews afterwards chang'd this Posture into that of Leaning or Lying along; and our Saviour finding this Custom prevail'd in his Days, comply'd with it when he celebrated the Passover, (*Mat. 26. 20.*) Which plainly shews, that we may many times comply with the Churches changing even a Divine Institution for a Human one; and why not therefore with the Churches allowing of Lay-Baptism in Cases of Necessity? Again, our Saviour reproving the Jews for their over Rigid Niceness in observing the Divine Institution of the Sabbath, tells them, *That David* *"when he had need did take and Eat the* *"Shew Bread, and gave to them that were* *"with him which was not lawful for him* *"to eat, neither for them that were with him,* *"but*

" *but for the Priests alone* (St. Mat. 12. 4. St. Mark 2. 25, 26.) making *David's* Necessity a sufficient Reason, for dispensing at that time with God's own Positive Institution about the Shew-Bread. And further, our Blessed Lord upon the same occasion reproving the *Jews*, says, that *God will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*, (St. Mat. 12. 7.) Which is sufficient to instruct us, that in Cases of Necessity, the Positive Institutions of God himself must be sometimes dispens'd with, for the supply of our wants, and consequently, that Baptism in cases of Necessity, where a Priest cannot be had, may be Validly Administer'd by a Lay-man, to supply the Spiritual Wants of those who are Unbaptiz'd.

Ans. THIS Objection consists of so many particulars, that 'twill be necessary for me to consider it, in the same order wherein it lyes. And,

1st. THE Posture of standing to Eat the Paschal Lamb was no more than a *Temporary* Institution, peculiar to the Celebration of the First Passover in *Egypt*, the very Night the *Jews* were to Depart out of that Country. This is plain, from the reason of God's appointing them to Eat it in such a Posture of Travellers, *in haste, viz.* because he would " *pass through*

M

" *the*

c the Land of Egypt that Night, and Smite
d all the First-born in Egypt both of Man
e and Beast, (ver. 12.) which would have
 such an Effect upon the Egyptians, that
 they would be very pressing and Urgent
 upon the Children of Israel to depart out
 of their Country to be rid of their Com-
 pany, for whose sake they had suffered so
 many and great Plagues, and were now
 depriv'd of their First-born, throughout
 all their Houses and Families, see Exod.
 12. from ver. 29. to ver. 34. And, if the
 Children of Israel had not been that Night
 in such a Travelling Posture, they would
 not have been prepar'd for so sudden and
 hasty a departure, as the distracted and
 terrify'd Egyptians oblig'd them to, wher-
 by they might have been expo'd to abun-
 dance of Inconveniencies, both from the
 fury of the Egyptians, and their own Un-
 preparedness for a Midnight Journey: And
 therefore, that they might not be thus in-
 commoded, God requir'd them to eat the
 Paschal Lamb *a* in haste, with their Loins
b girded, their Shoes on their Feet, and their
c Staff in their Hand, to be ready for their
 Journey at any warning that should be
 given them that Night; but after their
 departure the Reason of this Appointment
 was'd, and therefore so did the Appoint-
 ment

ment it self, and consequently was no longer binding and obliging: and we never find this Travelling Posture repeated in any of the after Celebrations of the Passover: but that it was only a *Temporary Institution*, peculiar to that First Celebration, I appeal to the Learned Jews both Ancient and Modern, and also to our best Commentators upon the place, (see Bishop Patrick, Grotius, Diodati, Pools Synopsi, &c.) to whom I refer the Reader, that I may not be more Prolix upon this Subject.

THE Posture of Standing then, being not enjoyn'd to be constantly us'd, *was an Essential Part* of the Institution of the Passover, and therefore 'twas afterwards *indifferent* what Posture the Jews should Eat the Paschal Lamb in; for which reason, their Church certainly had power to appoint any *innocent Posture* she should think fit; and since *Leaning or Lying along* was determin'd by her, and prevail'd in our Saviour's Days, and he was pleas'd to conform to it, we ought to follow his Example in complying with such Institutions of the Church as are not *contrary* to the Law of God. But this Instance do's not allow us to comply with the Church's *changing* a Divine Institution for a Human one; because, the Church of

the Jews did not herein **change** a *Divine* into a *Human Institution*; for, the Posture of Standing was then *no Divine Appointment because not Essential to the Passover*, and therefore the Church of the Jews did not **change** this into another Ceremony, but **appoint** the *indifferent Ceremony* of Lying or Leaning, when ther was *no Divine Institution* at that time, obliging them to any other Posture.

A N D therefore, we ought not, *from the Authority of this Instance*, to comply with the Church's allowing of Lay Baptism in Cases of Necessity, because Baptism by a **priest** is Essential to Christian Baptism, and as much obliging as the Institution of **water** it self, during the utmost term of the Christian Dispensation, as I have prov'd under the 1st and 2^d Propositions. And a Lay-man's Baptizing to confer Supernatural Benefits, is **no indifferent Circumstance** in the Power of Man to determine and appoint, as was the Posture of Lying or Leaning along, when the Church of the Jews appointed it; and therefore, from that Church's Example and our Saviour's conformity thereto, no Argument can be drawn to support the Validity of Lay Baptism, even in Cases of greatest Necessity, because the quality of the Person who
is

is Authoriz'd to Baptize for Supernatural Purposes, is determin'd by no other than a mere Positive Divine Institution. And no Case of Necessity whatsoever can determine any other means for the conveyance of *Supernatural Benefits*, than what are already reveal'd to us; except God shall be pleas'd to make some New Revelation of his Will for such a Purpose.

2. AS for the Instance of *David* and his Mens Eating the Shew-Bread; least Men should from hence encourage themselves to break through all the Divine Laws to supply their Necessities, 'tis necessary to consider, what Circumstances of Necessity will excuse our breaking a mere Positive Institution of Religion.

First, THEN, considering that all God's Positive Institutions are appointed for our Obedience, nothing can excuse us from the Breach of any one of them, but some other more incumbent Duty, which at the same time stands in competition with the Positive Duty.

Secondly, THE means of supplying our Necessities, must either be such as are of a *natural Efficiency*, or else efficacious by virtue of a *Divine Institution*, Administer'd just as God himself has appointed.

BOTH these circumstances concurr'd

in David and his Mens eating the Shew-Bread, and not one of them is to be found in Lay Baptism. For,

1st. **THO'** by the Positive Law, 'twas not lawful for any but the Priests to eat it, yet by the Law of Nature and Reveal'd Religion too, it was necessary to feed the necessitous Hungry; and David and his Men, wanting Bread, and ther being at that time no other to supply their Necessity (1 Sam. 21. 6.) the Priest gave him the Hallow'd Bread, that so the Law of Charity to the Lives of Men, enforce'd by a double Obligation, *viz.* by the Law of Nature and of Reveal'd Religion, might take place of the ~~mere Positive Law~~ about the Shew Bread, which had no other Obligation than from the Positive Institution only, with which the said Law of Charity stood at that time in competition; and this is exactly agreeable to what the Learn'd Dr. ~~Hobbes~~ says, in his Paraphrase upon St. ~~Mat.~~ 12. 3, 4 which because so very apposite to this purpose, I shall here transcribe for the Readers Information: His Words are these, "Remember the Story of David, 1 Sam. 21. 6, and by that you will discern that the Case of Hunger was Excepted, and Reserv'd in the Law concerning Holy Days or Things; For

" For there David and his Company being
 " press'd with Hunger, were by the Priest
 " allow'd to Eat the Shew-Bread, which
 " being consecrated did particularly belong to
 " the Priest, Levit. 24. 9. yet might it
 " seem (by the intention of the Law-giver)
 " to be by him employ'd in any charitable use, for
 " the Relief of others, as long as there were
 " more ready consecrated for the Sacred Uses,
 " 1 Sam. 21. 5. And accordingly, tho' the
 " Priest pretended not to dispense with any
 " (so much as Ritual) Part of God's Law
 " (as appears by the exception interpos'd by
 " him ver. 4. If the Young Men have kept
 " themselves from Women) yet he doubts not
 " to give them freely of the Consecrated
 " Bread; thereby assuring us, that it was
 " as lawful for the Priest to give some part
 " of the Consecrated Bread to relieve the
 " Hungry, as to Eat it himself; and so that
 " in the Law of Holy Things, not being
 " touch'd by any but the Priest, the Case of
 " Hunger or Distress was reserv'd, in which
 " it might by the Priest be lawfully given to
 " others. Thus far that learn'd Author.
 But nothing of all this occurs in Lay
 Baptism: for the Positive Law requires
 that Baptism should be Administer'd by
 a Priest of God's Appointment; and
 there is no Law of but equal, much less

of *greater* Obligation that requires a Layman to Baptize at all: Natural Religion does not oblige him to Baptize, because Baptism is no part of Natural Religion; and as for Reveal'd Religion, that has not requir'd him to Baptize; and therefore in Cases of greatest Necessity, if he does Baptize, he acts *without any Duty incumbent on him*, contrary to a Positive Institution, which is no Ways consistent with this Instance of *David* and his Men.

2^{dly}, T H E means of supplying the Necessity of *David* and his Men was Bread, which has a Natural Physical Efficacy to satisfy Hunger, and consequently to preserve Humane Life; but Baptism has no Natural Physical Power to convey to us the *Forgiveness of Sins*, and the *Gift of the Holy Ghost*: its Efficacy for such Supernatural Purposes depends only on a Positive Institution, and therefore, *is not at all parallel* to the Instance of the Shew-Bread; and consequently, under this Second Rule, nothing can be inferr'd from *David* and his Mens Eating that Bread to a Lay man's Administring Valid Baptism, because they are things of quite different Natures and Effects, and no ways applicable to one another. So that to bring Lay-Baptism to this Second Rule, it must be prov'd Efficacious

cious by virtue of a Divine Institution Administer'd just as God himself has appointed: but this can never be done, because there is no Divine Institution of Lay Baptism.

IN short, to sum up all that I have said or need to say about this Instance of the Shew Bread: Bread, before 'twas set apart for Sacred Uses, was common for all Men to Eat for the satisfying of their Hunger; but the Administration of Baptism for *Supernatural Purposes* was never thus common: the Priests giving the Shew-Bread, when *no other was to be had*, was then an Act of Charity, to which he was oblig'd by the very Law of Nature, enforce'd by the Reveal'd Will of God, But Lay Baptism is no Duty incumbent on us either by the Law of Nature or Reveal'd Religion; the Law of Nature dictates nothing to us about Baptism for *Supernatural Purposes*, and Reveal'd Religion is wholly silent about *Lay Baptism* for such Ends. The Shew Bread had a *Physical Natural Efficiency* to satisfy Hunger and preserve Life, and therefore the Priest had encouragement to give it, because he had no reason to doubt of its good Effect; but Baptism has no *Natural Physical Efficiency* for *Supernatural and Spiritual Graces*, its Effects are purely owing to a *Positive*

Positive Institution only, and therefore we have no encouragement to hope for its Effects, when the Institution is not observ'd in all its Essential Parts, as it certainly is not when a Layman Administers. Further, in the Eating of the Shew-Bread there was *no contradiction*; the Priest did not give it to be eaten contrary to the Positive Institution, with a design by so doing to observe the same Positive Institution; but in Lay Baptism there's a perfect Contradiction; The Positive Institution of Baptism is broken, that by so doing the same Positive Institution may be observ'd and kept whole. From all which 'tis very clear and evident, that the Eating of the Shew-Bread, and the Administration of Valid Baptism (in Cases of Necessity) by a Lay-hand, are things infinitely different in their Nature, and consequently not at all applicable the one to the other. To which I beg leave to add, that the Eating of the Shew-Bread, was ~~no Authoritative Administration~~ *for the conveyance of Supernatural Graces*, as Valid Baptism most certainly is: And therefore 'tis no wonder, that God put a good Construction upon David and his Men's Eating that Bread to satisfy their hunger, when no other was to be had; and yet upon all occasions, severely punish'd the *Sacrilegious Usurpations* of every one that

that attempted to officiate in such Authoritative Administrations, as he had appointed for the conveyance of Spiritual Benefits; the *great Necessities* that urg'd them thus to officiate, were never admitted or allowed of, so much as but to mitigate their Crime, much less to make their Administrations Valid: This is apparently evident in the Case of *Sam'l's* taking upon him to offer a Sacrifice in his great Distress, when his Enemies were coming upon him, when he might have been slain before he could make his peace with God, when the Priest *Samuel* was not present; when he had waited and strove so long, that he at last forc'd himself to offer a Sacrifice to procure the Divine Favour. We see, that all this *Necessity* and the absence of the Priest! this eager desire to obtain a Blessing! was no excuse for his assuming the Priest's Office; God would and did punish him for it, by rending the Kingdom from him, and giving it to another as you may see in *1 Sam. 13*. This is a standing Example, upon which we should always fix our Eyes, and thereby learn, that however God may excuse in some cases of Necessity, he will never do it in such great Instances, as the taking upon our selves to Administer, or willingly concurring with those who do Minister in the Priest's Office, without being called of God, as was Aaron.

3. AS for that other Text, where 'tis said *I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*, it will as little serve for the Validity of Lay Baptism as the rest. For the occasion of our Saviour's using those Words, and the place of Scripture from whence he quoted them, do evidently prove, that the Design of this Text is only to convince us, *that such Positive Institutions as are here call'd by the Name of Sacrifice, were never appointed to frustrate and make void our Obligation to the Genuine Moral Duties of Natural Religion, particularly those of Justice and Equity, and of compassion and charity to the Necessities and Wants of our Fellow Creatures; but that on the contrary, our Want of such Excellent Moral Virtues, and our being of an unjust, uncharitable and cruel temper, will make those Positive Duties when perform'd by us, both loathsome and abominable in the sight of God.*

THIS I say is evident, First from the occasion of our Saviour's referring the Jews to that Text, "*I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*"; for the Disciples being hungry plucked the Ears of Corn on the Sabbath-Day, which the Pharisees observing, affirmed, that it was a Breach of the Sabbath, and therefore unlawful for them to do at that time; but our Saviour (who very well knew the barbarous Cruelty of their temper)

temper) bid them remember the Case of David and his Mens Eating the Shew-Bread, &c. and then tells them, "if ye had known what this meaneth, I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the **Guiltless**, St. Mat. 12. 7. Whereby he prov'd the Innocence of his Disciples, that they had not at all broken the Sabbath, by thus plucking the Ears of Corn to assuage their hunger; and that consequently, the *Moral Duties* of Mercy, and Works of absolute Necessity, were never intended by the Positive Institution of the Sabbath, to be reckon'd as Breaches of the Duty of Rest, which God requir'd on that Holy Day.

2dly. THE Place of Scripture from whence our Lord quoted those Words is *Hosea 6. 6. I desired Mercy and not Sacrifice*, This does not mean that God did not require Sacrifice; for 'tis plain that he did require it, and all other Positive Duties signified by that general Word; and the Jews at that very time were bound to observe and obey all the Positive Institutions of the Mosaic Law, under no less penalty than that of "Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the Words of this Law to do them. Deut. 27. 26. So that the *not Sacrifice* here must mean

mean [not only Sacrifice] or [not Sacrifice alone] and therefore, the plain Paraphrase of this Text is "*I desired or Requir'd not only Sacrifice, not only your Obedience to my mere Positive Institutions, but also your Observance of my Moral Law of Mercy and Kindness.*" 'Twas the want of this and other Moral Virtues, together with their being guilty of cruel Murders, Robberies, and other Immoralities, that God complain'd of, almost throughout this whole Chapter, and for which he abhor'd their very Sacrifices, tho' they were of his own appointment, and they were then bound and oblig'd to offer them to him: This is also confirm'd by *Micah 6.* & *Isa. 1. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, &c.* All which being duly consider'd, sufficiently declares, the sense and meaning of [*I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice.*] that the design therof is not to make void our Obligation to obey the Divine Positive Institutions; but to convince us, that the *Moral Duties of Natural Religion*, reforc'd by Divine Revelation, are so far from being inconsistent with, That they must constantly accompany and attend our Obedience to such Positive Institutions, and that our Approaches to God in his Positive Institutions, without such Moral Virtues, are so

so far from being accepted that they are hated and abhorr'd by him.

AND therefore, all that (at most) can be inferr'd from those Words of our Saviour is, that *when a mere Positive Institution stands in necessary competition with a Moral Duty of natural Religion, reinforc'd by Divine Revelation, then the mere Positive Institution must give way to the Moral Duty for that time and circumstance.*

NOW then to try to apply this to the Case before us. Ther's a Divine Positive Institution, requiring Baptism to be Administer'd by One who has Christ's Commission for so doing. This Baptism is appointed to be a Means of conferring such merciful Graces and Benefits, as our miserable Nature, could never have made any claim or title to, and which all the powers of Nature could never have bestow'd on us. It happens, that a Person wanting these inestimable benefits most earnestly desires to obtain them by Baptism; but a Minister with Christ's Commission, is neither now, nor likely hereafter to be had: what then must be done in this extream Necessity? Why says the Objector, *God will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*: and therefore, since Sacrifice now stands in competition with

with Mercy, the Sacrifice must give way to Mercy; the Divine Authority of the Administrator must not now be insisted on; but the Mercies and Favours must be bestowed on the Person by a Lay man's Administring Baptism to him. This seems to be well said; but upon examination 'twill be found, that no such thing can be justly inferr'd from this Text, because, the *Mercy* there spoken of, is a *Moral Duty* of Natural Religion, and to be extended to the Indigent and Necessitous by *Natural means*; but the *Mercies* to be receiv'd by Christian Baptism, are infinitely above all *Natural Religion*, and consequently not to be convey'd by any *Natural means*. The reason why we are oblig'd to perform those Natural Acts of Mercy, even when they seem to run counter to some mere Positive Institution, is because *Natural Conscience* dictates this Duty, and *Divine Revelation* has reinforc'd its Obligation; whereas we are bound to observe a *Positive Institution* merely upon the account of a Divine Law promulg'd to us, without which we could never have been oblig'd to the Observation of it. But this Reason is wholly wanting in Lay Baptism; For *Natural Conscience* dictates nothing to us about bestowing of *Supernatural Mercies*,
by

by means of any kind of Baptism whatsoever; and as for Reveal'd Religion, that is wholly silent about a Lay-man's being ever capable of conveying such Mercies to us by means of Baptism; so that the Lay-man has this Duty incumbent on him neither by the Law of Nature, nor of Divine Revelation; and therefore, if he baptizes for Spiritual Purposes, *that he may shew mercy*, he ventures to do otherwise than the Positive Institution of Baptism requires, and at the same time is destitute of any the least encouragement from the Text objected, because ther is no Law either Natural or Reveal'd that obliges him so to do.

BUT further, when God will *have Mercy and not Sacrifice*; it is not intended, that one or more Essential Parts of a mere Positive Institution, should be more necessary and obliging to us than the other Essential Parts therof. No, all that God then requires of us is, to prefer a Moral before a mere positive Duty, as is evident from what I have already said on this Subject. But our Assertors of the Validity of Lay Baptism in Cases of Necessity, do unavoidably run themselves into this Inconsistency, of making one or more Essential Parts of a mere Positive Institution,

N

to

to be of *greater Necessity* and Obligation than another Essential Part of the same Institution ; for, they make *Water* and the *Form of Baptism* to be more necessary and obliging, than the *Divine Authority* of the *Administrator* : but this Notion I have already endeavoured to confute in the *Second Proposition*; to which I refer the Reader, and desire him here to observe, how very disagreeable this is with God's requiring *Mercy*, a Moral Duty, and *not Sacrifice*, a mere Positive One : For 'tis in effect to make God say, instead of [*I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice,*] *I will have Sacrifice, and not Sacrifice* ; since ther is not one of those Essential Parts of Baptism but what is merely of Positive Institution. This, of making one Essential Part of such an Institution, to give way to the other Essential Parts therof in Cases of necessity, without a particular Revelation of God's Will for so doing, is so strange, so unscriptural a Practice, that ther is not One Example of it in all the Sacred Writings of the Old and New Testament, from the first Chapter of *Genesis* to the last of the *Revelations* ; but on the contrary, we have a flagrant instance of God's punishing this Practice in the Person of *Saul*, who in his *Necessity* that he might obtain *Mercy*,
made

made one Essential part of a positive Institution, to give way to another of its Essential Parts; for the Priest, one Essential Part of the positive Institution of Burnt-Offerings, being absent, he reckon'd the Burnt-Offering to be more Essential than the Administration of the Priest, and therefore offered a Burnt-Offering himself; for which rash Action Samuel said to him, *Thou hast done foolishly, (i. e. wickedly) thou hast not kept (but hast broken) the Commandment of the Lord thy God, &c. — Thy Kingdom shall not continue, &c. 1 Sam. 13. 11, 12, 13, 14.* Here his endeavour to obtain Mercy, by means of *but part of a mere positive Duty*, is, notwithstanding the urgency of his necessitous Circumstances, branded with the Name of a foolish wicked Action; and because 'twas not attended with the other Essential Part, *viz. the Ministration of the Priest*, was so far from being esteem'd a Valid Offering to God, that it prov'd instead of a means of Mercy, a Judgment and a Curse to the Offerer and his Posterity.

THUS we see, that tho' God will have us sometimes extend *our Mercy* rather than offer *Sacrifice*: yet when ~~Mercy~~ *Mercy* is to be obtain'd *from him* by means of *Sacrifice*, i. e. such mere positive Duties as he has requir'd,

he will not grant us the Mercy we sue for, by means of *but part of such Sacrifice*; nor we must either beg it of him by our Observance of *the whole Institution*, or else when we **cannot** have the whole, sit down contented till we can, since he has declar'd his abhorrence of such *partial Sacrifices*, and therby taught us that they are *no Sacrifices at all*. 'Tis worth while to observe here, what Samuel tells Saul, (after he had reprov'd him for breaking God's Commandment about Burnt-Offerings) *for now, (says he) would the Lord have established thy Kingdom upon Israel for ever, 1 Sam. 13. 13.* — As much as if he had said, "If thou hadst
 " not attempted to gain the Divine Favour
 " by so unwarrantable an Action; if thou
 " hadst been patient in thy Necessity, and not
 " endeavour'd to render God propitious to
 " thee by such an unlawful Method; He is a
 " God of Mercy, and would not have imputed
 " Sin to thee for want of a Burnt Offering,
 " when it could not be had according to his
 " Institution; but on the contrary, would have
 " esteem'd thy not meddling therein to be an
 " Act of Obedience to his Command; and
 " consequently (tho' ther had been no Burnt
 " Offering made to him) would have been
 " gracious and merciful to thee and thy Chil-
 " dren after thee; and as a Reward of thy
 " Faith

*" Faith and Obedience, would have establish'd
" the Kingdom to thee and thy Sons for ever.*
This I say is plainly the scope and meaning
of *Samuel's Words to Saul* ; whereby we
also are encourag'd not to distrust the
Divine Goodness, but constantly and pati-
ently to wait and pray for it, without pre-
suming to endeavour to obtain it by *partial
Sacrifice*, when we are under such sad cir-
cumstances, as not to be able to seek for it by
whole Burnt Offerings ; when we cannot have
entire Baptism according to the Instituti-
on ; when there is no Priest to Administer
it to us ; then 'tis a greater Act of Faith
and Obedience, to refuse than to accept
of supposed Baptism from a Lay hand :
Nay, for one who knows the Nature and
Extent of the Institution of Christian Bap-
tism, to accept of, or acquiesce in Lay Bap-
tism in Cases of suppos'd Necessity, 'tis a
great presumption ; because, 'tis expecting
God's Mercy to be convey'd by such Hands,
as *he has not appointed* for that purpose,
and to whose Ministration he never requir'd
our obedience ; 'Tis the superstition of
making that absolutely necessary to salva-
tion which God has not made so ; as if
when we ~~want~~ those means which he has
appointed, he could not extend his Favours
and Graces without them ; as if ther were

a *greater degree* of Holiness in Water, and a Form of Words, than in the Institution of the Christian Priesthood; as if none could be saved without the former, but every body without the latter; as if Water could be a means of Graces *given*, without the mediation of one who do's truly *personate* God the Giver. In short, 'tis Superstition, nay and Presumption too, to expect Mercy by means of but **part** of a Sacrifice, when God appointed that the **whole** should be the means of obtaining that Mercy. And 'tis so exactly parallel to *Saul's* case, and so infinitely different from the design of the Text objected, that we may very fairly conclude, that Lay Baptism cannot be Valid even in Cases of Necessity; it cannot be sufficient, "*to supply the Spiritual Wants of those who are* Unbaptiz'd, because ther's no comparison between the *Natural Means* of Administering to the ordinary wants of the Necessitous and Indigent, and the *supernatural appointed means* of supplying the *Spiritual Wants* of the Unbaptiz'd; for these latter are of so extraordinary a Nature, that no less than Mercies Supernatural are sufficient for so great a purpose; and therefore, no other method must be used to obtain such Mercies, than what he who is to bestow

bestow them has appointed. *Obedience in this case is better than Sacrifice, especially than such a false Burnt-Offering, as Saul, in the instance above-mention'd, presum'd to offer to God: and may we all take warning by his Punishment not to confine God to our Will worship, not to meddle in his Positive Institutes, and expect that he should concur with our foolish and presumptuous interposing, in such Ministrations as he has confin'd to the Authority and Administration of his, and his Christ's appointed Priests and Ministers only.*

I CONCLUDE this Appendix, Most earnestly intreating the most Reverend, the Right Reverend, and Reverend, **Governours** and **Ministers** of Christ over his Flock in all parts of the **Universal Church**, The **Priests** of the most high God! who are duly Authoriz'd to represent and make visible to us, the once visible, but now invisible **priesthood** of the great high Priest of our Profession **Christ Jesus!** who have not taken this Honour unto themselves without being call'd of God, as was **Aaron!** who are therefore the delegated **Ambassadors** for Christ, and appointed **Stewards** of the **Mysteries** of God, to whom he has given the **Keys**.

and committed the Custody of the **Two great Seats** of the Kingdom of Heaven, so that whatsoever they shall bind on Earth shall be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever they shall loose on Earth shall be loosed in Heaven ! I humbly beseech them, in the Bowels of Jesus Christ, to consider the great Dignity of their High and Holy Calling, and their **inalienable** Right to Administer those **Sacraments**, which the infinite Wisdom of our great Law-giver has appropriated to their sacred Function. For If the ministration of the Sacraments is not **essential** to their Office, and **their Office essential** to the Ministration of Valid Sacraments, what signifies the Institution of the *Priesthood*, and to what purpose did our Blessed Lord promise to be with his Priests and concur with their *Ministrations to the End of the World* ? If the presumptuous Ministrations of Laymen acting of themselves, or in opposition to the Church and her Priests, is not inconsistent with the Nature and Property of True Sacraments ; or if they can be *True and Valid* Sacraments when given by their Hands, how, and by what means, shall we be convinc'd, of the necessity of the Christian Priesthood to the Church by Divine Institution, and its perpetuity till the
the

the consummation of all things ? How shall we be perswaded to value the Ministrations of a Priest more than those of a Lay-man, and what Arguments can be produc'd for the preservation of the *Unity* of the Church, and to keep us from eternal Schisms and Separations from her ? Your *long silence* in not asserting and defending the *Dignity of your Office*, and the *unalienable* Nature of those Sacraments which Christ has inseparably annex'd thereto, tho' it may have proceeded from a Notion of Humility and Modesty, *that you might not be thought to preach up your selves, but Christ Jesus the Lord* ; Yet (with submission be it spoken) seems to have been the occasion of *much Ignorance* among the Laity of the nature of Schism, and their duty to you, and consequently of encouraging the Enemies of the Clergy and their great Master in Heaven, to blaspheme him, and trample the Authority you have from him under their Feet. Atheism, Deism, Profaneness, Blasphemy, and Sacrilege, are now grown Impudent, and Barefac'd, Bold, and Rampant ; they scorn any longer to dwell in Obscurity and Darkness, when they are become the fashionable accomplishments of *our pretended great Wits ! and Men of distinguished Sense and Judgment !*
They

They have a grand design in hand, (and their Emissaries have prosecuted it but with too much success) to represent your Office every where and to all sorts of Men, as Tyranny, Imposture, and Usurpation; to wrest the Sacraments out of your Hands, that you may become useless and insignificant; to make the giddy Multitude believe that all you do is nothing but *Priestcraft*, to bring and keep them under a worse than Egyptian Bondage; to expose you to the Rage and Fury of an *ungovernable Mob*, and so at last to hiss you, and all *reveal'd Religion*, off of the Stage of this World. What else mean their several execrable Books and Pamphlets that are now industriously publish'd, of set purpose to decry your Office, and ridicule your Ministrations? How shall the Ignorant be defended from their Infection, but by the Antidote, which some of you, both by Books and Sermons, have already begun to apply, courageously following the Example of the great *St. Paul*, who *magnified his Office*, and thereby the Authority of Jesus Christ who sent him? God be praised for these happy beginnings, these first noble performances in maintaining your Office & in defence of the *true Rights of the Christian Church*, deposited in your Hands by the
 great

To the READER.

jest) did grant, that such Baptisms are not wholly Valid, because, that Council Canon 38, requir'd Lay Baptiz'd Persons to be **PERFECTED** by Imposition of the Bishops Hands [See Prelim. Disc. Page 12.] Now this their Concession, whether 'twas the true sense of that Canon or no, I thought convenient to make use of as an Argument against them, to prove that Imposition of the Bishop's Hands, or Confirmation only, cannot possibly give entire Validity to that Lay Baptism which was partly Invalid before. And this is no other than Argumentum ad Hominem, which I had never made use of; if it had not been pleaded from that Council, that I ought not to require Episcopal Baptism, because, the Bishop having confirm'd me, that Act of his gave entire Validity to the Lay Baptism administer'd to me in my Infancy, tho' it was partly Invalid, before such Act of Confirmation.

Whereas **PERFECTED** in the sense of the Council and those times, only signifies Finished and Consummated, as all Lawful Baptisms were thought to be by Chrism and Imposition of Hands, which in those Days was immediately perform'd after Baptism, or as soon after as possibly could be. — Again in

Page 108 & 109. ther's another Passage which possibly may be cavil'd at, viz. How a **SINFUL** Act should be **VALID** for supernatural Purposes is utterly inconceivable, nay, 'tis abominable to affirm it. For some will say this is inconclusive, 'tis no argument, because many sinful Acts are certainly Valid; as the Marriage of Minors without, and against the consent of Parents; a Priest's administering the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist to adult Persons not duly qualified, and the like; but the Answer to this is easie, for these sinful Acts, are not Sins against the very Essence of the Institutions of Marriage, &c. but only against some accidental circumstance. But the sinful Act I am speaking of in the forecited passage, is a Sin against the very Essence of the Positive Institution of Christian Baptism, and therefore not parallel with those Instances.

3dly and Lastly, in the Appendix.

Page 135. and forward in answer to the 10th Objection, I have attempted to Prove the Validity of Holy Orders conferr'd on Unbaptiz'd Persons. What I have propos'd in order thereto, I desire the judicious Lovers of Truth to interpret only as an Essay; I am not so fond of any thing I have said about it, as to strive with those who differ from me; nay more, if it should be generally condemn'd by Learned Men I shall acquiesce, acknowledging that they argue well who say, that 'tis suppos'd a Man ought to be a Member, before he can be a Minister of Christ in his Church.

What I have said in the following and other Parts of this Book, in general Terms, against the Churches Power, to give Authority to a Layman for the Administration of Valid Baptism in Cases of extream Necessity.

To the READER

cessity, I think necessary by way of precaution here to explain, by telling my Reader, that tho' I have not said so in express Words yet I design thereby to mean such Laymen, as either 1st, in opposition to the Episcopal Authority, or else 2^{dly}, not in Subordination to it, whether Bishops, the Spiritual Governours of the Church, who have power from Christ to give a Man a standing Commission to be a Priest, cannot give him a Commission *pro hac vice*, in Cases of extream necessity, to do a Sacerdotal Act. I will not presume to determine, neither do I think it necessary to dispute against those, who affirm that they can; provided the Layman be in communion with, and an actual Member of that Particular National, or Provincial Church, over which the Bishops preside who give such an Occasional Commission, provided also, that they give him this Commission in such a manner, and with such Limitations and Restrictions, as that ther may be no more reason to suspect the Truth of the Divine Authority residing in him for the executing of that Sacerdotal Act *pro hac vice*, in a Case of extream necessity, than ther is to question the Validity of the standing Commission of the ordinary Priesthood; for then, in such Case, the Man acts not of himself, or as a mere Laick; he is suppos'd not to Administer, by vertue of any Canon of Foreign Councils, but as impower'd by the Authority of those particular Bishops he is subject to; and I think it necessary to make these Provisoos, because on the other Hand it is well known, how apt Men have been, and still are, to pervert and abuse this Power and Authority, and misapply it to wrong and ill Purposes by unsound and false Inferences, (as I my self have found by Experience in my Conversation, relating to my own particular Case) so far as at last to make the Christian Priesthood be esteem'd by the heedless Multitude, as a thing of no necessary use and value at all, and for this Reason 'tis that I have endeavour'd so much (in this Essay Page 83. and Appendix Page 155. and 156.) to shew the ill uses which Men are apt to make of the Churches Power.

After all, whether a Church has or has not the Power of Authorizing her own Laicks (as above specified) to Baptize in Cases of Extremity, I think I need make no scruple to say.

1st, That the practice of one National or Provincial Church in this Case cannot Authorize the Laicks of another such Church, which gives them no such Authority. — (as here with us.)

2^{dly}, That no Church can have any Power to allow Laicks of opposite Communion to her, to administer Baptism in that Case, much less when ther is no necessity at all, (as certainly ther is none in our Dissenters Baptisms.)

3^{dly}, That no Church has or can have power to confirm Baptism so administered, because Confirmation supposes the Person to have been validly baptiz'd before, and his Baptism to be consummated and finish'd thereby.

Christi
at all.
this A
but pr
and W
I m
Paul:
escape
may
the tr
hall l
clear
this I
1st
Pa
" o
" af
wher
bear
P
" v
ing
beca
sam
nat
I
and
-

THE Author's Premonition TO THE READER.

THE occasion of writing this Essay is sufficiently declar'd in the Title Page; and the Design thereof is to contribute something towards the recovery of those, who are almost drowned in the fatal Error, of thinking that they receive Christian Sacraments, when in Truth and Reality they receive none at all. I don't doubt but I shall procure to my self many Enemies by this Attempt, but no matter for that, if this, my poor endeavour, can but prove effectual to stir up the Clergy (whose Office it is) to Preach and Write frequently, to disabuse Mankind in so weighty an Affair. I am well aware, how diligent the Adversaries will be to find what Faults they can; and I am not so vain, as to think my self to have escaped altogether free from some in this Essay. And therefore, that I may take away all Occasions of unnecessary dispute, and save my self the trouble of future Answers to what may be cavil'd at by some, I shall here once for all declare what I think necessary, for the more clear Explanation of my Design and Meaning in some Passages of this Book, which otherwise I fear may give offence. And,

1st In the Preliminary Discourse

Page 13. I have noted from Du Pin, that "The Council of Neocaesarea, Anno 314, Canon I. says, that if a Priest marries after he has been Ordain'd, he ought to be **DEGRADED**, whereas, in Truth that Author should have said, he ought to forbear the Exercise of his Office.

Page 20. I remark, that "the Hereticks and Schismatics were suppos'd to be **EXCOMMUNICATE**; my meaning is, that they were esteem'd **AS EXCOMMUNICATE**, because they separated from the Communion of the Church; and the same is meant of the known Excommunicated Hereticks and Schismatics a little lower.

Page 23. My Censure of the Church may be reckon'd too harsh and severe for those early Days of Christianity; but I design no more thereby

To the READER.

therby than to represent that "after Anno 300 she *BEGAN* to be, (not that she actually was immediately after that Period) "miserably "over-run with Error and Superstition. From that time ther was a gradual Declension from the Apostolick Purity; and tho' the Faith was kept Whole and Entire, yet ther were some Mixtures made, some bad Foundations laid for after Miseries and Confusions, which infested more especially the Roman Church, to whom I had an Eye in that Censure. And I cannot see, but the Canons concerning the Celibacy of the Priests (tho' grounded on the general practice of the Primitive Clergy) gave occasion to the Church of Rome afterwards absolutely to forbid the Clergy Marriage, and to oblige them to vow Celibacy, as if Marriage were an Abomination to that Order of Men.

Page 24. I say, "The Decrees of Fathers and Councils have "no more weight with me in this matter (i. e. of Lay Baptism) "than what they receive, from their Conformity to those Divine Oracles, &c. Here some may probably ask me, "who must be judge between you and the Councils? I answer, the same as must be judge between the contradictory Canons of different Councils; the same as must be judge between me and a Council that commands me to worship Saints and Angels, &c. Now who this is upon Earth I cannot tell; a living infallible Judge we have none; and therefore I must look for a Rule or Guide, i. e. the Holy Scripture, and if the Councils and I differ about the sense of this Rule, I must have recourse to the *BEST* and *PUREST* Ages of Christianity, and see what the Apostolick Fathers and the Councils next after them understood by that Rule in the controverted Point. After all I must be allow'd a judgment of Discretion for my self, in conjunction with a just deference to the Canons of that particular Church, whereof I am, or ought to be a Member; and by all these Methods I am brought to conclude for my self, that Lay Baptism by one in opposition to the Church can never be Good and Valid.

Page 30. Where I say that "I am not to be put off with the "Authority of any great Names, separate from Scripture and Reason, I desire to be understood of Reason in the Object, as Learned Men call all Mediums or Arguments of Proof; among which for the Authority of the Scriptures, and the sense of them in disputed Places, I unfeignedly declare, I look upon the consensient Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Church, to be the best and strongest Proof.

2dly, In the Essay it self.

Page 82. I speak of the Council of Eliberis, Anno 305. as if it esteem'd Lay Baptism in Cases of Extremity, to be "in some measure "Invalid, till it was perfected, or rather mended by Imposition "of the Bishop's Hands. See the same again Page 109. The reason why I do so is, because some (with whom I conserr'd upon this Subject)

great Author of our most holy Religion: and may he, by the blessed influences of his Spirit, stir up many **more of you to Cry aloud and spare not, to lift up your Voices like a Trumpet, to shew the People their Transgression, and those who strive with the Priest their Sin, Isa. 58. 1. Hos. 4. 4. and Rom. 2. 8.** That they may learn to **know** and submit to those who are over them, (in the Lord) and who watch for their Souls, Heb. 13. 17. That they may esteem them **very highly** in love for their **works** sake, 1 Thess. 5. 13. Because they are the **Ministers of Christ, and Stewards of the Mysteries of God, 1 Cor. 4. 1.** That the People may effectually be enabled to mark and avoid those, who tho' they come to us in **Sheeps Cloathing, and transform themselves into the appearance of Apostles of Christ, and Ministers of Righteousness, are yet inwardly but ravening Wolves, false Apostles, deceitful Workers, and Ministers of Satan, in St. Paul's Language; for they cause Divisions and Offences contrary to the Doctrines which we have Learn'd, nay, contrary to the very Principles, or Foundations of the Doctrine of Christ, of Baptisms, and of Laying on of Hands, and therefore should be avoided, that we may keep the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond** of.

*of Peace ; which that we may all learn to do, and by your consentient **constant warnings** be preserv'd from the dreadful sin of *hating Sound Doctrine, and heaping to our selves Teachers* destitute of the Divine Commission, who *serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own Bellies*, may God of his Infinite Mercy grant, *through Jesus Christ, to whom be Glory for Ever and Ever. Amen.**

F I N I S.

to
unt
lful
ing
Di-
ord
God
esus
and